

human welfare. In fact, it was born to fight for freedom—and still does.

The Republican record of a century clearly proves that all through our history our party has provided sound Government services to foster the well-being of farmers, workers, businessmen, children, and others and to meet future national needs.

The Lincoln administration founded the Department of Agriculture and initiated the first Homestead Act, which gave land to farm families who would work it. Republicans passed the Sherman Antitrust Act to protect small business against monopoly. To insure workers' rights Republicans started the Bureau of Labor which later became the Department of Labor. Republicans established the merit system through the Civil Service Act of 1883.

Republicans protected family health through the passage of the Pure Food and Drug Act and the Meat Inspection Act. Republicans in 1912 established the Children's

Bureau after the passage of child labor laws in many Republican States.

The Panama Canal was built to meet future needs. Under President Theodore Roosevelt, programs also were launched to conserve the Nation's forests, minerals, and water resources. One of the conservation measures to preserve water and timber resources was the Weeks' Act of 1911—introduced in Congress by my father, when he was a Representative.

Later the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was established; the Federal Land Banks were strengthened; a new system of agricultural credit banks was organized and the Home Loan Bank System was created to assist individual farm and individual homeowners. These latter protections against adversity were initiated in the administration of your honored guest, that lifelong humanitarian—President Herbert Hoover.

Republican policies today are the expression of our party's great century-old prin-

ciples, dressed in the clothing of this current age.

So we are in keeping with a century of Republican accomplishments for the American people, when Republicans insist that Government must have a heart as well as a head.

We also are in harmony with our 1956 platform, in step with our Republican President and in line with the overwhelming majority of American citizens, when we support programs reflecting a hard head, a warm heart, and a far-seeing eye.

Let us go home with renewed faith that Republican policies are helping to encourage a healthy and growing economy with prosperity widely shared and are helping to advance peace, justice, and freedom. Let us, by our attitude on public issues, prove worthy of the trust the American people have placed in our party and in our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, Thou art always waiting and willing to dwell in and with us and to pervade and possess our minds and hearts with Thy divine spirit.

Grant that we may be men and women whose life and character are inspired by the highest ideals and the most sacred traditions.

Hear us in our prayer of intercession as we beseech Thee to bless all who are having such a tremendous struggle with the hard facts of life.

Lift from their troubled souls those strange feelings of loneliness and anxiety when their faith is in danger of becoming eclipsed by doubt and despair.

We pray that they may have the glad assurance that Thou art great and good enough to care for them and that where Thou dost guide Thou wilt provide.

In Christ's name we bring our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 607. An act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes.

"DUTY TO COUNTRY" THEME OF BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 6, is the first day of

Boy Scout Week, observing the 47th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. The theme of this anniversary is "duty to country."

Over 200 boys in Cub Scout blue and gold are visiting Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, and other high Government officials to present them with Scouter pins emblematic of the occasion. These boys have been selected to represent over 38,000 Cubs, Scouts, explorers, and leaders in this area. Many are sons of people from our own States. They are ambassadors of good will, inviting us to join over 3 million Scouts and Cubs in recognition of Congress chartering the Boy Scouts of America in 1916.

The theme this year is in the highest Scout tradition. Scouting is a program of character development, citizenship training, and mental, moral, and physical fitness. Scout ideals are inspirations to these youngsters, preparing them in body, skill, spirit, and will to be good citizens.

The great principles of Scouting are heartening and helpful to all of us. There is no finer exposition of the spirit of our Nation than the 12 parts of the Scout law. None is more timely than duty to country. I believe the last two parts of the Scout law also are timely and valuable to the boys themselves, in view of conditions in today's troubled world. I commend them particularly to your attention. They are:

A Scout is clean. He keeps clean in thought and body, stands for clean speech, clean habits, clean sport, and travels with a clean crowd.

A Scout is reverent. He is reverent toward God. He is faithful in his religious duties and respects others in matters of religion and custom.

Today the young people of America are subject to many influences. No endeavor is more deserving of universal support than Scouting, which leads them in the path of good citizenship. Scouting is doing its part. We should all do ours.

In my own State of Kansas all seven Scout councils have shown a healthy increase in numbers of Boy Scouts and Scout activities. We have received immeasurable benefits from Scouting. Twenty-five million boys and young men

have gone on, through Scouting, to become useful citizens.

It is a real privilege to wear the Scouter pin presented by my Cub Scout visitor this week.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4249), making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate not exceed 4 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could we not get along with less than 4 hours of general debate? I have no requests for time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is the first appropriation bill and there are some requests for time for general discussion, I have asked for this time. In view of what the gentleman from New York says, I ask unanimous consent that debate not exceed 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]

said that he had had no requests for time. Some of us did not know it was coming up. I, for one, would like a little time to get some explanation of how I can go along with the administration on foreign aid and still cut down here and make things come out all right.

The SPEAKER. The question may be bothering a great many Members of the House.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4249, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is the first appropriation measure to be reported by the committee and considered by the 85th Congress.

Its components will be explained by the chairmen of the respective subcommittees having jurisdiction.

This measure is separate and apart from the budget for the fiscal year 1958. It deals with money need arising prior to the commencement of the fiscal year beginning next July 1.

However it is not separate and apart from the warning sounded by the Secretary of the Treasury simultaneously with the presentation of the new budget that it is of transcendent importance that expenditures be kept at a minimum consistent with essential disbursements in order to avoid dire consequences. That warning did not apply alone to expenditures after July 1. It encompasses the present as well as the future.

The committee has had Secretary Humphrey before it in connection with his emphatic statements to the press in criticism of the budget. Our inquiry cannot be described as fruitful in any way with reference to counsel and advice as to where the reductions he discussed with the press might be applied. The Secretary blows both hot and cold. He expresses one opinion to the press and the opposite opinion to the committee. He is for the budget as written one day and cannot find a dollar that can be cut and he is against the budget the next day as a work of iniquity leading directly to hirsute cocklebur entanglements.

It may also be said that the estimates of appropriations on which this bill is based do not evidence particular care and watchfulness on the part of the executive branch in holding its requests for funds to actual requirements for the remainder of this fiscal year. They do tend to support and emphasize Secretary Humphrey's view that the 1958 budget is excessive—and makes clearer the necessity for finding and eliminating excesses.

As judged by its budgets this is an ever-broadening and continually expanding Government. Each year and each session Congress initiates new

activities requiring more money and the executive departments reach out for more power, more employees, wider jurisdiction, and more money.

But, unfortunately, the budget does not tell the full story. When all the extras are added up the Government will collect from taxes and other revenue \$98.9 billion and will pay out the incredible amount of \$95.6 billion.

This includes payments from a growing number of trust funds, the latest of which include highways and welfare, all of which will be larger every year.

But as high and unwieldy as this budget is—\$3 billion above last year—and that was a record peacetime budget up to that time—and \$8 billion increase over the 1955 budget—the Director of the Budget expresses no hope that it will ever be smaller. I personally think we ought to be able to hold the overall total pretty close to what it now is—at least another year or so. That means no tax cuts.

The budget and its architects seem to involve us in a vicious circle of tax and spend and inflation and depreciation of currency and increased cost of living. They are all interrelated and interdependent and the administration, speaking through its Budget Director seems to add the last paralyzing element of hopelessness:

Mr. BRUNDAGE. . . . I would certainly hope we would be able to reduce taxes. If we can hold our expenditures for a couple of years at even this level, I think the expanding economy will enable it.

Question. You think it is doubtful whether we can hold them at this level or not? You think if there is any change in this budget, it will be up instead of down?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. I am fearful of it; yes.

And that means no tax cuts. If we are to continue to spend this vast amount of money, we must continue the Korean war taxes to pay the bills—to balance the budget. And the present surplus of only \$1.8 billion is a very narrow and tenuous margin. If even a mild recession drops on us—as Secretary Humphrey intimates—what will be the reaction in the value of the dollar and the quotation of United States bonds over the counter?

Already the interest on our national debt exceeds all Government expenditures in the fiscal year of 1938.

Let us take a realistic look at the rate at which ruinous inflation is already eroding our economies. Let me quote from the book *Personal Estate Planning in a Changing World*, by Rene A. Wormser. The first edition of this book was published in 1942. The eighth edition came off the press about a year ago. So authoritative is this work that the entire book was reprinted verbatim by the U. S. News & World Report a week or two ago.

I quote a paragraph from page 3:

In the first edition of this book I warned against the imminence of inflation; my prediction was all too correct; we have had it, several doses of it. Will it continue? That is a matter of debate. I think it will. It could be stopped if the American people should insist on it; it will not be stopped if the trend toward the welfare state continues. At any rate, in the face of the very severe degree of inflation which we have had to date, it would be stupid to plan without taking its possible continuance into account.

Here and there, throughout the text, you will see references to the inflation problem. It merits most serious concern. Inflation is partially confiscatory in the very operation of our tax system—why legislators do not realize this, I do not understand. The capital-gain tax is confiscatory when it taxes those profits which are a mere reflection of the loss of purchasing power of the dollar and not true profits at all. The income tax, the gift tax, and the estate tax are all on a sliding scale. Therefore, they also are confiscatory during inflation. Let me give you an example under income tax. You have an income of \$10,000 per year and there is a 50 percent inflation. So you manage to raise your income to \$15,000 and think you are level with the inflationary rise. You are not. For you reach higher tax percentages with your new income and thus pay disproportionately more taxes. This principle operates similarly under gift tax and estate tax. To compensate for inflation, tax rates should be reduced, but the tendency is always to raise the percentages instead of to lower them.

Ever since this book was published inflation has continued. If you build a house the cost is obsolescent from the time you lay the foundation. If you take out life insurance, your family are robbed before the premiums are due. Every computation the dollar buys less and the cost of living is higher. Why? Because this administration has not kept its pledge to economize. Because this Congress passes larger appropriation bills every session. Even the record-breaking revenues pouring into the United States Treasury cannot keep up with the spenders.

The source and compilation of this budget is one of the inscrutable mysteries of all time. The men always consulted and whose ideas are traditionally reflected in the budget are the Secretary of the Treasury, former President Herbert Hoover, and JOHN TABER, ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations which formulates the appropriations bills to carry it into effect. All of them have, in effect, repudiated this budget. All three of them have said it is too large, that expenditures contemplated by the budget are too high. The President himself has said in practically every speech and statement made on the subject, that we should economize and he proposed to retrench expenditure. And yet, I repeat, this budget is \$3 billion higher than last year and \$8 billion higher than the 1955 budget. Somewhere along the line, somewhere after Secretary Humphrey and ex-President Hoover and Meatax JOHN TABER advised the President, a more potent force, an overriding influence has upped this budget beyond anything some of us here in the House ever dreamed of. JOHN has been called down to the White House repeatedly and had breakfast with the President just before he left for the South.

Someone says the country is for it; that the people want larger budgets. In the last 2 weeks I have received personal letters from nearly every State in the Union—every one of them urging a reduction in the budget. And every responsible metropolitan newspaper in the Nation has emphasized the unwieldiness of the budget; its contribution to infla-

tion, to the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, and to its foreclosure of any hope of tax reduction during the fiscal year—during the next 18 months; to its inevitable acceleration of the coming depression. "If this country does not reduce the tax take"—and the tax take, national, State, and local, is now 29 percent of the national income—"if this country does not reduce the tax take you will have a depression that will curl your hair." And in this morning's paper President Hoover says: "Mine has already been curled once—and I think I can detect the signs." There you have the voice of experience. Herbert says he thinks a depression is on the way.

A day or 2 ago Secretary Humphrey was asked if the Government should speed up public works when private capital drops? The Secretary answered, "No." Yesterday when asked the same question he said, "I think you would." But he qualified it. He said, "outlays should be handled in such a way as not to shake confidence"—implying increased Federal outlays ran the risk of impairing business confidence to such an extent that private spending might be cut back further. So you are between the devil and the deep blue sea. You can spend and curl your hair—or you can throw in public works and destroy the confidence of private capital.

But still you have not told us who wrote the budget.

The Secretary of the Treasury has been incendiary in his reference to the budget and in his comments upon the phenomenal and unprecedented size of it; and President Hoover in calm and deliberate, but a concise, statement says in this morning's paper that it is beyond all reason, or words to that effect. My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], whose denouncement of high budgets is traditional, is no longer

risking high blood pressure in his comments on Government spending. How often have we been edified by his old battle cry: "Why, it's ridiculous." He has been overlooking that time honored expletive this session; I have not heard him say this budget is ridiculous yet, although in days gone by he has employed that expressive phrase when budgets were many, many times smaller.

Apologists for this budget insist that it is in response to popular demand. And that would seem to be a logical conclusion. But when we look into the matter a little more closely it does not seem to be borne out by the opinion of the average taxpayer. I have had letters in the last 3 weeks from practically every State in the Union and without exception they said the budget ought to be reduced.

I said in a statement to the press that we were increasing expenditures instead of decreasing expenditures and that nobody seemed to care; that the most alarming thing about this alarming budget was that nobody was alarmed.

Many wrote, "You are wrong about that, we are concerned, but what can we do about it?"

In response to those letters never have I presumed to tell anybody what he should do. I have never said he should write to the President or take it up with his Congressman or bring pressure to bear on his Senator, although at this late date there seems to be no alternative if this budget is to be reduced. It must be reduced by the executive department or by the legislative branch of the Government.

In connection with these statements by our senior statesman, former President Hoover, for whom I have the highest regard, whom I quote always with respect, I would like to make a brief reference to the Hoover Commission.

One of the greatest pieces of propaganda that was ever circulated—and not by the Commission itself—in the history of the United States was to the effect that the Commission had recommended measures which, if adopted, would save \$4 billion a year.

That statement has had the widest circulation. Every metropolitan paper in the United States has copied it, and I think every Member of Congress must have received letters asking "If you can save \$4 billion merely by adopting that recommendation of the report of the Commission, dealing largely with book-keeping, why do you not do it? Why not save \$4 billion a year?" The Committee on Appropriations, naturally, received many inquiries about it and I asked the Director of the budget to come up and see us. He came up, and JOHN TABER and I talked to him, and we said, "We have considered the report of the Commission very carefully, and we do not see anything in any recommendation of the Commission that would save \$4 billion," and the Director of the budget said, "I do not, either." He said, "As a matter of fact, I do not see anything in the recommendations that would save \$4 million much less \$4 billion." We had him up again on the 24th of this month, January 1957, and again I asked him about it, and you will find it in the hearings where he said "It is absolutely impossible to prove these savings." He went on to say he thought we had saved money, of course, but he could not prove that the adoption of any recommendation by the Commission had saved or would save a single dollar.

It does not seem to be generally known that the Congress has adopted many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. At this point I will include a list of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission adopted.

Actions of 84th Cong. on Hoover Commission reports

Public Law No.	Date approved	Subject
Public Law 16	Mar. 25, 1955	Extended the Reorganization Act of 1949 to June 1, 1957.
Public Law 41	May 23, 1955	Extended the Hoover Commission to June 30, 1955.
Public Law 55	June 1, 1955	Facilitated liquidation of Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
Public Law 61	June 3, 1955	Improved program for donation of surplus property for educational and public health purposes.
Public Law 68	June 10, 1955	Provided for reclassification of postal employees.
Public Law 83	June 16, 1955	Limited veterans' dental care to service-connected disabilities or conditions.
Public Law 88	June 21, 1955	Extended program of direct loans to veterans for housing until July 25, 1957.
Public Law 161	July 26, 1955	Authorized headquarters for the Central Intelligence Agency.
Public Law 182	July 28, 1955	Authorized Federal grants for program of research on mental illness.
Public Law 232	Aug. 4, 1955	Authorized President to lease the Alaska Railroad to private interests.
Public Law 245	Aug. 5, 1955	Amended Career Compensation Act to permit nontemporary storage of certain personal property.
Public Law 268	Aug. 9, 1955	Continued Small Business Administration for 2 years. (Included in Public Law 268.)
Public Law 304	do	Established the Commission on Government Security.
Public Law 334	do	Authorized the Comptroller General to relieve accountable officers of financial liability in certain instances.
Public Law 345	Aug. 11, 1955	Separated the Home Loan Bank System from Housing and Home Finance Agency.
Public Law 347	do	Increased rate of retirement of Government capital in certain institutions operating under supervision of Federal Farm Credit System. (Included in Public Law 347.)
Public Law 365	do	Partially implemented recommendation incorporated in Public Law 334 above.
Public Law 497	Apr. 30, 1956	Increased pay of Air Force medical officers.
Public Law 538	May 28, 1956	Authorized armed services to utilize commercial shipping in transporting military cargoes.
Public Law 569	June 7, 1956	Provided for medical care of Armed Forces dependents through insurance.
Public Law 608	June 22, 1956	Provided for the disposal of the Texas City Tin Smelter.
Public Law 655	July 3, 1956	Authorized donation of surplus property for Civil Defense purposes.
Public Law 666	July 9, 1956	Vested primary responsibility for water pollution projects in States.
Public Law 705	July 14, 1956	Simplified computing of fees charged executive agencies for use of the United States mail.
Public Law 786	July 25, 1956	Extended the Commission on Government Security to June 30, 1957.
Public Law 798	do	Expedited payments of certified claims where appropriations have lapsed.
Public Law 809	July 26, 1956	Merged Production Credit Corporation in Federal Intermediate Credit Banks.
Public Law 852	July 31, 1956	Included the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in sec. 158 of the Revised Statutes.
Public Law 854 ¹	do	Provided for pay increases for certain executive officers.
Public Law 863	Aug. 1, 1956	Revised budgeting, accounting, and allotment procedures in the Federal Government.
Public Law 941	Aug. 3, 1956	Established a National Library of Medicine.
Public Law 971	do	Extended authority to negotiate the disposal of surplus property.
S. Res. 285	July 11, 1956	Provided for a study of the foreign-aid program by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.
H. Res. 118	Feb. 2, 1955	Authorized the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to investigate the necessity for continuing the Panama Railroad.
H. Res. 262	July 5, 1955	Authorized an investigation into unnecessary Government paperwork.

¹ Public Law 854 also incorporated a Hoover Commission recommendation authorizing the President to appoint the chief legal officers of certain executive agencies.

A supporting list is attached. The staff report comments that this reflects substantial progress when it is considered that the final report of the Commission was not received until near the end of the 1st session of the 84th Congress. It also states that 5 years were required to effectuate some 70 to 75 percent of the recommendations of the first Commission.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATION

On October 15, 1956, the President stated:

A number of the most important recommendations require congressional action. With bipartisan support, a modest start was made at the last session of the Congress. I propose to transmit further specific legislative proposals to the next session of the Congress, and I am hopeful that these will receive the wholehearted bipartisan support which they merit.

As with all legislation, any Presidential proposals along these lines will be subject to recommendation by the legislative committees having jurisdiction. As to these, perhaps this paragraph from the statement of general dissent by one of the Commissioners sums up the situation:

With their sensitivity to public issues, their varied experience in legislation, their party obligations, and their public responsibilities as elected officials, the Members of Congress are better qualified to make policy judgments and to legislate for the national welfare than any 12-man commission.

As a matter of fact, we have adopted everything that is practical and consistent in the Hoover Commission recommendations, approaching it from a bipartisan point of view. But, we have not yet been able to show a saving of \$4 billion; we have not been able to show a saving of \$4. For example, I am enclosing a table here which shows that while we have been adopting these recommendations of the Commission, the expenses of the Government, instead of being retarded, have gone steadily upward. Never once could it be said definitely that the adoption of any recommendation by the Hoover Commission resulted in reduced expenditure.

Beginning back in 1950, when the total budget was \$29.6 billion, and coming down to this budget, when it has increased from \$29.6 billion to \$71.8 billion, it shows that all recommendations by the Hoover Commission have, up to this point, so far as we can judicially determine, been without effect in holding down the budget.

Federal budgetary spending since the first Commission reported follows:

	Billions
1950	\$39.6
1951 (war year)	44.1
1952 (war year)	65.4
1953 (war year)	74.3
1954	67.8
1955	64.6
1956	66.5
1957 estimate (\$70.1, including highways)	68.9
1958 estimate (\$73.6, including highways)	71.8

I mention this because the fallacy persists, and it is still circulated. For example, I have received, and I take for granted every other Member of the Con-

gress has received, in the last week a questionnaire sent out by the junior chambers of commerce embodying this repudiated and exploded fallacy.

In the bill before us we have taken the current situation much to heart. We have made material savings. We have reduced the estimates far below the total of the requests of the departments and of the Budget Bureau. If in every appropriation bill submitted to the House this session we are able to make the same percentage of savings we are making in this bill, we shall achieve a situation which will greatly relieve the fears and apprehensions expressed by the Secretary of the Treasury and by ex-President Hoover.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. A while ago the gentleman spoke of numerous letters that he received, I believe he said, from all of the States, by people asking what they could do to cut the budget. The gentleman says he did not refer them to the President or any of the Members of the other body or to any of the other Members of the House. Just what did the gentleman tell them they should do in order to hold down the budget? I am interested. I would like to draw from the gentleman's wisdom on that subject.

Mr. CANNON. I wrote to them and told them I was in hearty accord with their sentiments and that so far as I was concerned I would make every effort to reduce the budget. I did not feel it devolved upon me to ask them to write to my colleagues. I assured them that so far as I was concerned I would be glad to cooperate in bringing the country back to solvency.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations has before you a bill for certain deficiency or supplementary items. Those relating to agriculture relate to loans to farmers and to some of this drought-relief proposition. The one of the Department of Commerce relates to the Small Business Administration and is entirely for loans and the additional expense of operations which the loans entail.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Department has \$275 million to carry out the provisions of the increase in the old-age assistance items that were adopted a year ago after the regular bill and such supplemental bills as it could be applied to and disposed of.

An item in the Interior Department portion relates to the procurement of strategic and critical materials. The Director of Defense Mobilization is on record with a statement that they have procured all of their requirements for the stockpile and have sufficient stocks of the type of things it was proposed to purchase to carry them for at least 5 years even in time of war.

The other items relate to legislative housekeeping.

Frankly, the reduction which has been made in these items below the budget estimates total in the aggregate \$46,977,000. That is 12.5 percent of the amount of the budget estimates, \$382 million.

The items represent a very careful screening by the Committee on Appropriations of the items that were submitted to them. Frankly, for my own part, I am interested in operating on the day-to-day budgets that are submitted to us and I am not so much interested in what people say about it as I am about approaching it with a sense of responsibility.

Let me say to the Congress that the budget is in our lap regardless of what the budget is as submitted. It is in our lap now and it is up to us to find out what it is for and how badly it is needed, and to find out just what is needed and to bring out what is necessary to carry on the functions of the Government, and nothing more.

For my own part, I have today called attention to the savings that have been made in the estimates and I propose from day to day and from week to week as the other bills come before the House to call attention to any bill where I believe the adjustments and the cuts that are justified have not been made. I do not care what they are. I shall follow that through clear to the end of the session. Frankly, I believe there are spots where money can be saved, and I propose to do what I can to save funds wherever it is possible. It would not do any good for me to get up here and to tell where I believe those spots are. That would just put the demanding service on notice of where their weaknesses are and I do not propose to advertise that for their benefit. I hope, and I am just going to say this much and then I am going to quit, I just hope that the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress will go down the line and cut every dollar that they can cut out of this budget which is before us, and that we will meet our responsibilities to the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELL].

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, as I understand it the Appropriations Committee struck out President Eisenhower's supplementary budget request of \$67,500 to reestablish immediately 24-hour quarantine service for the shipping industry.

Three years ago the Congress passed H. R. 6253, a bill I introduced to allow health officers to receive overtime pay—the same as customs and immigration officials. At that time the President was instituting a general study of overtime rates of pay of Federal employees, so, although he stated the bill had merit, he vetoed it.

Under existing operations, any ship arriving from a foreign port after 5 p. m. has had to anchor and wait until the next morning before it could clear quarantine and dock.

Since our American-flag ships on foreign routes are subsidized by the Federal Government, the cost of holding up docking of these vessels to a large extent is paid by Uncle Sam. The pay of the crew and the cost of feeding all persons on board runs into thousands of dollars

per night per ship and in turn this situation increases greatly the cost of Government subsidy. I understand this amounts to approximately \$10 million per year.

So it seems clear that the action of the Appropriations Committee in disallowing this small amount is false economy.

Personally, since I heard of the committee's action I have felt inclined to offer an amendment to restore the amount. But unless the distinguished chairman of the committee and ranking members and all members on both sides of the aisle will accept such an amendment, I will limit myself to the earnest request that if the other body allows the funds, then our House conferees will consider the merit and net economy and accept the amount.

I am sure what I have said is true, and there will be a substantial net saving to the taxpayers if President Eisenhower's request is allowed.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say to the gentleman in this regard that I have prepared an amendment which, I understand, is agreeable to all the members of the committee, which will remedy the situation without a nickel of cost to the Government and the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. PELLY. I am very glad to hear that. I am sure that it will result in substantial savings to the taxpayers by reducing the amount of Government subsidies to the shipping lines that go to foreign ports. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, included in this urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1957 are three items—agricultural conservation measures for the agricultural conservation program which the committee reduced from the budget estimate of \$25 million to \$15 million. The \$15 million provides for funds to assist farmers in carrying out emergency measures to control wind erosion on farmlands and to rehabilitate farmlands already damaged; two, to reimburse the President's Disaster Relief Fund for funds advanced to the Secretary of Agriculture; and three, loan authorizations for the Farmers Home Administration.

Last year there was a severe flood on the west coast and a grant of \$300,000 was obtained from the President's Disaster Fund to deal with the land restoration measures in California and Oregon. In addition, a hurricane struck Puerto Rico doing a great deal of damage to the coffee plantations. An advance of \$1,100,000 was made to help with restoring that land by clearing it of debris and getting it into productive use. Because of the accumulation of balances, the Department assures us they will be able to meet these advances with the million dollars of extra funds which is restored to the President's Disaster Fund. The committee is pleased to note that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico expended

approximately two-thirds of the total requirements.

Language was submitted to the committee which would have appropriated \$25 million of unused 1956 agricultural conservation program funds to assist farmers in carrying out emergency measures to control wind erosion and to rehabilitate lands already damaged. The committee felt that an emergency program of this nature should be financed by direct appropriation rather than from funds previously appropriated for the regular agricultural conservation program. Agricultural conservation program payments are distributed to the States by an established formula assuring each State its share of these funds. The committee is desirous to maintain equality in the distribution of these funds and desires to resist any temptation to divert these funds for other uses even though these uses may be necessary and constructive.

It is felt that each State should be given ample opportunity to make use of these funds and that the proper consideration of any unexpended balance ought to be made when the regular appropriation bill is under consideration. It should be pointed out either way this item is handled, it would not, in my estimation, result in a saving of taxpayers' money, inasmuch as any unused balance of funds for the ACP program will be taken into consideration by the committee in considering the regular appropriation bill. Requests were made for \$10 million to be used for practices which would not be put into use until late summer and fall of 1957. The committee felt that it would be undesirable for the Congress to make commitments for the next fiscal year in the urgent deficiency bill feeling that it would be more desirable to consider these items in the regular appropriation bill which would be in ample time to meet the requirements of this program. Furthermore, uncertain climatic conditions may alter the need for these conservation measures to a considerable extent.

The committee believes that full use of the funds for proper practices within the agricultural conservation program and other conservation programs of the Department would do much to prevent emergency conditions of this kind from developing. It recommends, therefore, that the funds included in the accompanying bill be used only after the Secretary is convinced that the regular conservation programs have been directed as fully as possible to practices needed in these areas.

A question has been raised as to whether or not authority for payments under this program should be made on a retroactive basis. It has been pointed out that payments for future work to be done gives farmers who have not yet done the necessary work an advantage over farmers in the same area who have already protected their land with such practices at their own expense.

The committee can fully appreciate and is sympathetic to this point of view. In view of the precedents established on this point, however, it does not believe that authority exists for it to reach back and repay farmers or others for

work already done or expenses already incurred.

The basic legislation supporting this type of activity makes no provision for such retroactive payments. Further, Congress has consistently resisted efforts to enter into retroactive assistance of this kind. Also, such action would raise numerous policy questions such as: how far back should such feature go; who should be included; and what area of the country should be included?

In considering the deficiency request for the Farmers' Home Administration the committee reported: The act of April 6, 1949, provides for emergency assistance in furnishing feed and seed to farmers, ranchers and stockmen in disaster areas designated by the President under Public Law 875. The Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1954 established a ceiling of \$50 million on the amount of the disaster loan revolving fund which could be used for this purpose. As of January 3, 1957, only \$210,000 remained available for this purpose. The President has proposed language to increase this limitation by an additional \$25 million in view of the serious feed problem still existing in the drought areas.

The committee recommends an increase of \$15 million in the limitation, a decrease of \$10 million in the budget proposal. Information presented during the hearings indicates that only \$10 million will be required during the balance of the current fiscal year. The amount recommended will provide a reserve of \$5 million for assistance in 1958 and subsequent years, and will permit reimbursement of the \$8 million secured from the President's disaster relief fund to supplement funds available within the disaster loan revolving fund.

At the time this emergency program was adopted by Congress, it was intended that the States would participate substantially in a financial way. It appears, however, that amounts advanced by the States to date have been very small—hardly enough to cover the cost of handling their contributions. The committee feels that steps should be taken to correct this situation. Accordingly, it recommends that, as soon as present contracts have been honored, the Secretary require that the governor or appropriate authority in each State participating in the program should commit the State to assume at least 25 percent of the cost.

Inasmuch as all of these items are consistently related to items which will appear in the regular appropriation bill, I wish to assure the Congress that our committee, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, will go into these items in our usual conscientious manner as we consider each one of them.

These are troublesome times particularly for the people who suffer from disastrous climatic conditions. Our committee is most sympathetic to those people in the drought areas. We appreciate the consideration that the Congress is giving to these items which have been gone over very carefully by members of the committee. We have agreed to those items which our committee feels can be

fully justified as emergency measures at this time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on the Department of the Interior has disallowed the supplemental budget request for \$30 million for purchase of four domestic minerals. They have disallowed it on the basis of the testimony of the head of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Dr. Flemming. He testified last year that tungsten and the other three minerals are not needed for defense purposes. He said we have enough tungsten in stockpile to last for 5 years. So there is no defense justification for this program. That was his testimony before the Senate in June 1956.

Senator DWORSHAK asked the president of the Tungsten Institute if the people who mine tungsten in this country sell any to domestic industry? And he was informed that the industry using tungsten does not buy one pound of the tungsten that is mined in this country. They buy tungsten that comes from foreign mines. Yet the United States Government is paying \$55 a unit for tungsten to several large producers and small producers, when you can buy a trainload of it on the market for \$35 a unit.

In my youth on a Friday afternoon some little child would get up and talk about the ride of Paul Revere. But the taxpayers should realize the ride they are being taken for now. One on the list of domestic producers receiving money under this program also has a large tungsten mine located in a foreign country. He has signed a contract to sell tungsten from this foreign mine to the United States Government at \$55 a unit. This contract does not expire until 1959. By that time he will have sold about \$39 million worth of tungsten to the Government.

Now somebody will come along and say: "Oh, it is an emergency." They will say: "If we shut down the mine we will never be able to open it up again." One of the leaders in the tungsten industry has admitted it is an up and down business. He has been in it since before the First World War and he has seen four periods like this. They shut down after the First World War, when the national debt was only \$23 billion, but now it is around \$270 billion, and we are paying \$55 a ton for this tungsten while the market price is \$35. We even went so far as to amortize taxes for some of these purchasers so that they could write off their investment for tax purposes in 5 years, under the stockpile program they got \$63 a ton, which was \$20 a ton more than it was selling for in the open market.

I do not want to take up the time reading things, but I want to read to you from the committee report about one producer under the new program:

The largest purchase during this period was from a group of 3 affiliated companies and totaled \$2,875,730, representing 19 percent of the total. A top executive of these companies testified previously that the authorizing legislation was needed in order that the domestic mines "can survive foreign

competition." The committee was astounded to discover through its own investigation that a dominant company in this group has the largest contract to supply tungsten to the Government from foreign mines. The committee is advised that this contract, for the purchase of over \$39,000,000 of tungsten at \$55 a unit, will not terminate until December 1959.

While the United States Government was paying \$63 a unit from 1951 until 1956, and the open market price dropped from \$64.63 in 1952 to \$35 in 1956, anybody could buy it. Yet the United States Government was paying, up until last year, \$63 a unit. Under this new program the Government pays \$55 and the market price is \$35.

I do not know how many such cards are in the deck, but just how long do you think we can survive if we continue to pay \$55 a unit when we could get all the tungsten we want for \$35.

The head of the Office of Defense Mobilization said there is no scarcity and no defense connected with this whatsoever. We have enough now in the stockpile for 5 years. Anybody who listens to the military will hear them come in and ask for billions of dollars for guided missiles and bombs and everything. They say the next war will only last a few months. The one that gets there first will win. If they are right, what are they going to do with this 5 years' stockpile of tungsten that we now have? They come in and tell you how swift and terrible will be the first blows in the next war, a flight of planes and then it will be almost all over. I say we are sufficiently stocked up with tungsten now that the supply would last us for 5 years even during all-out war. That is why the committee thought it was about time to eliminate something like this and I hope the Members today in their wisdom and judgment will back up the committee and vote down any attempt to put the item back.

When this program was authorized it came to the House under a suspension of the rules. Nobody spoke on the bill or for the bill until after it was passed, and then two Members who had a tungsten mine in their areas spoke about the necessity for tungsten. But there was not anybody outside of the man who sponsored the bill, who, incidentally, is a fine gentleman and a great Congressman, who spoke on the bill or for the bill. They held hearings in the committee, but the hearings were never published.

Again I ask you to support the committee should any attempt be made to restore this item to the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Who is responsible for executing the contract?

Mr. KIRWAN. The United States Government.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What department?

Mr. KIRWAN. The Department that is responsible for the stockpiling program. They are the ones that have been charged with the contract.

We sent our own investigators to look into the situation and we found one fel-

low selling foreign tungsten to the United States Government, the one with the largest foreign order which will amount to about \$39 million before the contract expires—selling foreign tungsten to the Government at \$55 a unit when the market price is \$35 a ton, and at the same time is selling tungsten from his domestic mines to the Government at \$55 under this program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You mean we have to carry out that contract?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not know whether we will have to carry it out or not, but we have decided to meet the issue by not providing any funds in this bill for purchases from his domestic mines, and I hope the House will back up its committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, some years ago the Secretary of Agriculture saw fit to ask certain Members of the Congress to serve on what was known as an advisory group, or as consultants to the special drought committee of the Department of Agriculture. I happen to have been named as one of the members along with one of our colleagues and 2 members from the other body.

For a time we had a few meetings with representatives of the Department. Those meetings never seemed to accomplish anything because our advice, as far as I could see, was never taken. It is true that those meetings did allow the Department to suggest from time to time: "Well, we have discussed this policy with representatives of the Congress, so our policy must be their policy."

For approximately 18 months no meetings have been held, but as late as last week the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and made substantially this statement: "I may say also that there are 4 Members of Congress who have been named as consultants to the committee, and they have on occasion met with us, Senator ANDERSON, Senator SCHOEPPEL, from your own body, and 2 Members of the House of Representatives. We try to consult with them even when they do not meet with the committee."

I want to make it plain that there has been no effort brought to my attention on the part of the Department of Agriculture to consult with at least this 1 of the 4 consultants for 18 long months. For that reason I have felt that these consultants could serve no possible purpose other than as a means to allow the Department to place blame on the consultants rather than to accept blame for an erroneous decision itself.

Therefore on yesterday I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture which I think I should read to the Members of

the House because it bears upon the action of this House. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., February 4, 1957.

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,

Secretary of Agriculture,

Department of Agriculture,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: Some 2 or 3 years ago I was advised that I had been named as 1 of 4 congressional advisers to your departmental drought advisory committee. Shortly after our appointment the advisers had several meetings with representatives of your Department. These meetings gradually became fewer. I believe the last was held about 18 months ago. Nobody in the Department has asked for my advice since then. My advice was not taken even when the meetings were held. I had supposed that you had considered that our tenure as advisers had ceased to exist. I was, therefore, somewhat surprised to learn that in your appearance before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last week you are reported to have stated:

"May I say also that there are four Members of the Congress that had been named as consultants to the committee, and they have, on occasion, met with us: Senator ANDERSON, Senator SCHOEPPEL from your own body, and two Members of the House of Representatives. We try to consult with them even when they do not meet with the committee."

Apparently you made the positive statement that you try to consult with these congressional advisers, although no such consultation has taken place with me for approximately a year and a half. I think that your statements are calculated to give the impression that the named Members of Congress exercised some influence in shaping the drought policy.

The Agriculture Committee of the House has made a serious and conscientious effort to deal with at least a phase of the drought program. A large number of bills were introduced something like 4 weeks ago on this subject. The committee on January 17 requested that your Department give it the benefit of the Department's views. Up until this morning we had not received any such memorandum of views. In the meantime, we held rather extended hearings. We invited the Department to send any individual they felt best qualified to speak on this program. Mr. Kenneth Scott appeared before the committee some 10 days ago and gave us 75 pages of testimony. He raised all of the questions that you have raised.

The committee felt that we had given the Department a fair and generous hearing and had not the slightest idea that the Department wanted to make any further presentation. The members of the committee voted to make certain changes in the bills as introduced and struck out one complete section, but then gave a unanimously favorable recommendation to the remainder of the bill. That legislation which had the support of both sides was scheduled to come before the House this afternoon. On Saturday, I first learned that you had sent a request, not to the committee and not to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, but rather to the minority leader asking that he use every possible means to defeat the passage of this legislation.

In the meantime, you had accompanied the President of the United States to several of the drought-stricken areas. You and the President have given out a number of statements asserting your desire to be of prompt assistance to the drought sufferers, but you have proposed no concrete program other than to ask for additional money, a large part of which has already been authorized by the House. Your action is now preventing the

passage of legislation which every member of the Agriculture Committee seemed to believe was desirable and helpful to the drought-stricken people.

I must, therefore, come to the regretful conclusion that the congressional advisers have no functions other than to share the criticism of the Department's actions. Since I have never exercised any influence, since my advice has never been taken and is no longer even asked, it seems to me that my continued membership on this advisory group serves no useful purpose. If I could see where my continuation on this group could be of any possible help to the suffering farmers and ranches of the drought area, I would certainly continue to serve regardless of any embarrassment that it might be to me, but inasmuch as it seems clear that I am helping no one except the Department—and that only in the matter of sharing blame—I believe that it would be in the interest of a clear understanding for me to remove myself. I am, therefore, resigning from this advisory or consultative group effective today.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman.

I feel, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, that the Members of this House should not be made the fall guys for the Department of Agriculture, and for one I do not propose to continue in such a position. I hope that the membership of the House will bear this attitude of the Department in mind when we take up the drought relief bill, which was reported by an unanimous vote of the House Committee on Agriculture. It is my hope that a rule may be granted this afternoon and that this bill may come before the membership of this House on tomorrow, in which event I hope all of those who believe in the integrity of this House, and the right of the Congress to determine legislation rather than merely to accept that which is forced upon us by the Department, will be here ready to record themselves in favor of a congressional determination of policy. I hope that we may adopt and that you will be here ready to implement a prompt program of relief for the drought-stricken areas rather than simply a newspaper program of expressions of regret about a drought situation that is affecting a very vast area of our country.

MR. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

TIRED OF BEING A GOAT

MR. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, during the past 22 years, the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan has probably cast as many if not more "No" votes than any other Member of the House.

He was forcefully reminded of this fact during the last campaign by his Democratic opponents.

In truth and in fact, the "No" votes, while negative in form, were affirmative in effect, because they were against wasteful, unnecessary spending, against the surrender of any part of our national sovereignty, in favor of the efficient expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars and adherence to our constitutional form of government.

No apology is now made for any of those votes.

Just a few days ago, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey suggested that, if we continued to tax and spend at our present rate, we might experience a depression that would make your hair curl.

The morning's press indicates that Mr. Humphrey has, to a certain extent, hinted that it might be necessary, in case of such a depression, to authorize a series of public works to take up the shock of unemployment.

That is nothing new. We did that back in the Roosevelt days. And it may be necessary and helpful as a temporary remedy.

Today's press carries the statement that, last night, 83-year-old former President Herbert Hoover, referring to Humphrey's hair-curling statement, said, "Mine has already been curled once—and I think I can detect the signs."

Since his inauguration, President Eisenhower has twice pointed out the necessity of lessened Federal spending if we were to avoid financial disaster—a depression.

Nevertheless, the President called upon the House to give him, and it overwhelmingly did give him, a blank check for the use of the military forces to defend the territorial integrity, the political independence, not of the United States of America, but of Middle East nations. That authority if exercised means the spending of additional billions of dollars—a further trend toward inflation.

During the last election, the officials of practically every pressure group in this country were on my political back, because I had not, over the years, gone along with their every demand.

Compliance with 95, or even 99 percent of their proposed legislative program was not enough. Failure to bow the head and bend the knee on every occasion was sufficient to justify a decree of political liquidation.

While many—no doubt a majority—of the Members of the House realize that deficit spending must end, the record shows that a majority continue to vote for increasing governmental expenditures. Many of them demanded by the administration.

While I may or I may not be a candidate for Congress in 1958, Members of the House will understand what I mean—at least I hope they will—when I here and now state that I am weary of refusing to go along with pressure groups demanding ever increasing Federal expenditures, of consistently voting against legislation calling for the expenditure of billions of dollars for foreign aid while others avoid criticism, political opposition, by consistently supporting the wasting of billions of our dollars abroad.

I was the only Member of Congress from Michigan who voted against giving the President authority to spend \$200 million abroad, authority to use the Armed Forces to protect other countries.

It all boils down to this. If a majority of the Congress is determined, as it seems to be, to continue increasing the taxpayer's burden by voting for every appropriation which is necessary to comply

with the demands of the one-worlders, the internationalists, the rulers of other countries—the spending of billions of dollars abroad for the benefit of other peoples—I have about reached the conclusion that it might be well, if we are determined to spend those dollars, to spend them here in America for the benefit of our own people—especially for the benefit of those who now, through no fault of their own, find it difficult to obtain food, shelter, and clothing.

Why should I attempt to force economy on the Federal Government if, at the same time, an equal or far greater sum is being wasted abroad?

If continued inflation is to ruin us, if a depression is inevitable, why not, while it is on its way, spend our money here at home?

Why should I make the people of my district mad at me if the administration and the Congress are to pour their dollars down rat holes across the seas?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I obtained a copy, which I have in hand, of the United Nations telephone directory. I do not know how many of you have seen it, but it is an interesting publication.

In view of the fact that this is the first appropriation bill of the session, I thought I ought to take a minute or two to call the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to a place where savings might be made. You understand, of course, that the Congress appropriates at least one-third of the running expenses of this modern Tower of Babel, known as United Nations headquarters.

Let me read you some of the clubs that are listed in this U. N. telephone directory:

The Art Club, the Badminton Club, the Ballet Club, the Ballroom Dancing Club, the Bowling Club, the Bridge Club, the Chess Club, the Cricket Club, the Drama Club, the Golf Club, the Gym Club, the Motion Picture Club, the Music Club, and the Press Club. Then there is the Recreation Council, the Singers Club, the Skating Club, the Ski Club, the Softball League, the Stamp Club, the Table Tennis Club, the Tennis Club, the Volley Ball Club, and the World-Wide Club.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], being the good angler that he is, might be disappointed in that they have no fishing club.

Then they have in addition to the above listed clubs, the granddaddy of all clubs. It is listed as "Clubs—general information." Evidently if you cannot get the information you want from these various clubs you can call "Clubs—general information"—and get what you want.

I have looked this list over pretty carefully. Each of these clubs has an office and each has a telephone. None of them is duplicated, that is, no two of these clubs are in the same office, so that each has an office and a telephone. I assume, and I think it is logical to assume, that the United Nations, using American tax dollars, provides a secretary at each of these offices and telephones. I suggest

that when they come before you looking for an appropriation this year you of the committee investigate what they have been spending.

I might call your attention to the fact that there is a "Delegates' Bar—North," and a "Delegates' Bar—South." I do not know why there is no "Delegates' Bar—East" or "Delegates' Bar—West," unless the delegates, the Russians in particular, would rather drink their vodka in the north or the south.

There is also the London School of Economics Society, and it also has its own office and telephone number. I do not know what the London School of Economics Society might be, but I assume that is the place where people are taught to value and devalue money at will, how to escape interest payments to the United States on the money that they owe, and how to influence this country to issue 95-day paper to the tune of nearly a billion dollars so that we pay the British for their invasion of and aggression upon Egypt.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am most happy to yield to my friend the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. One of my colleagues advises me that while I was called out to the phone, not by the White House, the gentleman mentioned the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan. Now, do not worry about it. I will go along with you on any economy program that you would like to sponsor.

Mr. GROSS. I thought, perhaps, that being the good fisherman that you are, the U. N. ought to have a fishing club to go along with a ski club, a soccer club, a ballet club, and a ballroom-dancing club.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, wait a minute, I do not know about the last two. So far as this fishing business is concerned, I buy my own tackle and I dig my own bait, and when I catch them, I clean my own fish. But, if you have noticed here, the Committee on the Interior has found plenty of land where there are many lakes and streams on which they hunt and fish. Have you noticed that? And the facilities to get to them in the armed services. So if I can get on the Committee on the Interior, I can get to go on some of those trips.

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to know that the gentleman from Michigan digs his own bait, but I suspect most of the U. N. club members spend most of their time cutting bait with which to catch American suckers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I never cut any bait for them. I will admit they catch plenty of suckers.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I dare predict that when the history of this era is written, this administration will be referred to as the great buck-passing administration. The President has passed the buck to us on domestic policy. He has passed it to us on foreign policy. He has passed it to us on monetary policy. He has passed it to us for budget-making.

I do hope, in fact I am almost certain, that this great Committee on Appropriations and the leadership of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is going to do a good job in cutting that budget.

I have a suggestion to make, and I do hope the Appropriations Committee will not think that one who is not a member of that committee is presumptuous in indicating a course of action. I suggest that the head of every Department seeking an appropriation be advised that unless that Department comes in and shows to the committee how it can cut the proposed budget by at least 10 percent, that you will cut their request 10 percent straight across the board. If they cannot come in and justify the figures submitted, warn them that the first 10 percent is going to come out of the salaries of the exempt jobs. Tell them that you are going to cut 10 percent off their salaries if they cannot show you how they can cut their own budget.

Everybody in the administration says the budget is too high and that it can be cut and it should be cut. Then, the administration leaves it to the Congress to find the ways and means of doing it.

I suggest that you take seriously what I have just said, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, and warn the heads of the departments that if they cannot find a way of cutting their appropriations, you are going to do it for them and that they may not like the way that you will do it for them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields back 3 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I might start my remarks by saying I think the Constitution places the buck on spending with the Congress. So it is very difficult to see how the Executive can pass the buck where the Constitution places it. I was quite interested in listening to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations talking about the budget and the height of the budget and the dangerousness of it. I believe he must believe that it is too high and yet throughout all of his speech I did not hear him offer one constructive suggestion of what he, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, was going to do about it.

I would like to make some suggestions of what he might have done about it.

No. 1 is the suggestion that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey presented to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and to the Committee on Appropriations also when he appeared before them a couple of weeks ago on the budget.

He had previously recommended to the Committee on Appropriations various ways and means whereby we might handle these tremendous budgets that are generated in this great Government in Washington; and a subcommittee was appointed, as I understand it, to go into these matters. Apparently that subcommittee is not operating, because Secretary Humphrey again mentioned it to

the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in these hearings. The chairman of the committee then said, "Would you be willing to appear before this committee to further those recommendations?" And he said, "Yes, I would." At that point the conversation is terminated. At least, as it is reported in these hearings.

I would like to know is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations going to do something about this and go ahead with this subcommittee and let us go into these suggested procedures as to how we can handle these budgets?

Secondly, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee referred to the Hoover Commission recommendations, and said that could be done just by accounting procedures. Why do we not do it? If we analyze those recommendations, the gentleman will find that a great deal must be done by the Congress and certainly a great deal must not be done by the Congress. I refer to one specific recommendation, which was to get the Government out of business, particularly the Military Establishment out of civilian type business. Yet we all witnessed last year and the year before this effort to throw a roadblock in the way of that orderly process, preventing the Military Establishment from getting out of those areas which would have saved considerable money.

Secondly, we have the requirement, by law, of the unification of the military services, particularly in the area of common-use supply items and the distribution of them. A subcommittee in the 82d Congress, of which I was a member, did a great deal of work in that area, and the Hoover Commission picked up a lot of their findings. Yet we find that to this date the Military Establishment has moved hardly at all in the unification of common-use supplies—I am not talking about airplanes and guided missiles and such things. A figure that everyone ought to be aware of is the fact that we are generating in our Military Establishment three to four billion dollars annually in surpluses that are sold at an average of about 8 cents on the dollar. The fact that annually you generate three or four billion extra property indicates how poor the procurement procedures must be. It is in this area that the Appropriations Committee could do a great deal of work.

Furthermore, we should look into the executive department's practice of obligation and deobligation of funds, the use of letters of intent, and the fact that these contracts are written as they are to avoid that magic date of June 30.

Furthermore, I might call attention to another procedure that has grown up and could be corrected in the executive department, but perhaps the Appropriations Committee might do something about it. The fact that the Bureau of the Budget now meets jointly with the Defense Department in going over the Military Establishment budget, instead of having the Military Establishment coming down to the Bureau of the Budget. The very fact that they have to go to the Pentagon and operate on this budget over there, sitting with the very

people who are trying to keep the budget up, is the wrong technique. Perhaps a little pressure by the Appropriations Committee might change that.

One matter was suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], a member of the Appropriations Committee, in these hearings, to which I was referring, where he said that for years he has been advocating a permanent investigatory staff. Why does not the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations implement some of these beneficial suggestions? Then we could get on top of this budget. I submit that Congress has a real job to do and a job that the executive department cannot do. The Government Accounting Office is an arm of the Congress; not an arm of the executive. Why do we not utilize the Government Accounting Office more? Why do we not create better liaison between the old Expenditures Committee, now called the Committee on Government Operations, with the Appropriations Committee. The material that committee gets on extravagant and foolish expenditures would be of inestimable benefit to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has stated that I have advocated the establishment of a permanent investigatory staff. I would like to explain that more fully. We do now have a permanent committee staff, a very well-qualified staff. Their time, however, is taken up with the regular committee work. What I had in mind was the staffing by the committee with additional men who could act as investigators to go into every detail of expenditure and really give our Appropriations Committees tools with which to do the job. That particular investigative staff should be on a permanent basis attached to the Committee on Appropriations. I repeat that our present very splendid staff does not have the time in which to do the job. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is making a very fine statement.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate the gentleman's further explanation. It is pointed out very clearly in the gentleman's remarks in these hearings, and it is important that they be emphasized.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. As the gentleman knows, when our party was in power in 1953, the Committee on Appropriations employed about 10 very expert accountants. Many of them right out of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And then we brought into Washington a number of public accountants from large business institutions. Ultimately we had a staff of about 50. They divided into small groups and went into every department of government and brought to us the facts as to where we could cut expenditures. As the gentleman knows that year we cut the President's budget by a sum of over \$10 billion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa's remarks

which were made at a point just preceding the remarks that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has herein inserted. Referring to the gentleman from Iowa's [Mr. JENSEN] remarks, I have had no opportunity of knowing what the remarks inserted by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] are. It is a point that should be made, and I suggest to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, if he is sincere, and I am sure he is, in his efforts to cut the budget, that he might well employ similar techniques that were used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] at the time he was chairman of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I cannot yield; I wish to finish my statement.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], of course, is too wise a man and too experienced in appropriation matters not to know that no Chief Executive can completely handle the budget. He does the best he can with it and presents it to Congress.

Every President knows, every executive knows, that his budget is going to be worked over. He knows also that the Congress has additional techniques that the executive department does not have in coping with these budgets. For instance, we can call in witnesses, we can use the facilities of the General Accounting Office, we can utilize the experience of the Committee on Expenditures in running down some of these things. There are so many techniques that the Congress has that are not available to the President.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not yield; no. I want to finish my statement.

That is the reason the Constitution very properly vests the authority on appropriations in the Congress.

Now I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The Congress has no spending authority. That is vested in the President.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Congress has the basic authority. Now I want to present some figures I have obtained pertaining to this particular budget, and I might say I disagree with the \$71.8 billion proposal if we are going to avert inflation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would like to ask just one question. Is there any authority that the President does not now have? Is not the President of the United States as Commander in Chief the person who should be best qualified and in the best position to bring about this unification and do away with this duplication of buying than any other individual?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, there is authority that the President does not have, but basically, I cannot agree with the gentleman more. I take exception to the criticism offered by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, when at the same time he is not assuming his

responsibilities in this area in not adopting the techniques available to Congress. I am critical of his statement when this budget is being presented and nothing is being done by the Congress about the failure to bring about unification of the armed services. In these areas there is a great deal to be done. If the Hoover Commission recommendations were implemented we would have saved 3 or 4 billion dollars a year. On the other hand, I might say, under the leadership of that side of the aisle, although there was help from this side, too, stones were thrown in the way of one of the recommendations and that was taking the Military Establishment out of business.

Now, I would like to get some figures in because much has been said about the actual budget itself. It is important to realize that at the end of fiscal year 1953, a grand total of balance available of unspent appropriations—that is, the authority to go ahead and spend this money from previous appropriations—was \$103 billion, \$60 billion of which was for defense. At the end of fiscal year 1957, and this is partly an estimate, the total for carryover of unspent items is \$70 billion of which \$40 billion is for defense. You will notice that is an overall cut of \$33 billion. At the end of fiscal year 1958, it is estimated the carryover of unspent appropriations will be \$70.5 billion.

Here is another set of figures. Twenty-two billion dollars has been cut off of these unspent appropriations. This is money that Congress said could be spent, but the executive branch did not spend. That shows a good course of action on the part of the executive department.

When Mr. Humphrey and the President stated they are going to continue to ride herd on these expenditures, I think we can take them at their word because they cut out \$22 billion they could have spent but did not spend. I think we have to view the picture as a whole. In other words, we have to consider the proposed budget in conjunction with the carryover unspent appropriations from previous budgets. By cutting down on the size of the carryover figures, both the Executive and the Congress gain a better control over expenditures and future appropriations. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee could assist in this endeavor, and probably right in this area the proposed budget could be reduced in size by a considerable amount.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself time to say that the Congress has no techniques which the President does not possess. So far as the General Accounting Office is concerned, it is open to him and his Budget Director as well as to us. As a matter of fact the Director of the Budget is himself a professional accountant.

Any suggestion that we have access to service denied the President is on the face of it without foundation.

The gentleman also refers to a recommendation made by Secretary Humphrey last year that all appropriation bills be completed in the House down to the final vote on passage and then held over until the end of the session and after all have been brought to this stage they be again passed as one bill. The suggestion was so absurd and so impracticable that the

committee refused to give it serious consideration.

Then the gentleman asks why we have not adopted the recommendations of the Hoover Commission when I have just shown we adopted all that were practical and identified them in tabular form, and included a table showing that the appropriation bills continued to increase under this administration, the Hoover Commission recommendations to the contrary notwithstanding.

On the motion to eliminate the roadblock against taking the Government out of business I call attention to the fact that this motion was by Chairman Vinson of the Armed Services Committee and that I voted with him to take the Government out of business.

The charge that the Military Establishment "generates 3 or 4 billion annually in surpluses which are sold for an average of 8 cents on the dollar," is made without concrete support but if it has any basis of fact it is an administrative function and the administration should remedy it.

He also complains that the Bureau of the Budget meets jointly with the Defense Department down at the Pentagon. That again is an administrative matter over which the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction. And he should address his complaint to the executive department.

The reference to large, unspent, carryover appropriation balances at the end of fiscal 1953 and the subsequent reduction of such balances in no way alters the essential fact, which is that expenditures under this administration have been increasing steadily during the past 3 years. Large unspent balances in 1953 are the natural consequence of appropriations, supported by both sides of the aisle, made during the Korean war. As indicated by the gentleman from Missouri, these balances are now on the increase, and, moreover, new appropriations requested are increasing each year. It is absurd to suggest that there is any achievement, or credit due, for reducing carryover balances by saying they could have been spent but were not spent. On the contrary, they were reduced only because they were spent—that is the way they were reduced. If the gentleman wants to claim a \$22 billion credit in this manner as an accomplishment, that is his privilege.

But the consummation of the gentleman's argument is that if the budget which the President sends down is not reduced Congress must assume responsibility. When the President's resolution on foreign policy came up in the House the other day it was the contention on that side that we should follow the President's recommendation. But when the President signs the budget and sends it down with the recommendation that it be passed as written—and when his Secretary of the Treasury and Budget Director appear before the committee and tell us that it should be passed without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t"—that they cannot recommend even the minutest change in it, then the gentleman from Missouri contends that we should not follow the President. Let me ask the gentleman when we should fol-

low the President and when we should not follow him. If the President thought the budget should be cut why didn't he cut it himself. If the gentleman's idea is correct this is the first President in the history of the Nation who has sent down a budget and asked that it be cut.

Now the gentleman from Missouri says we "can take the President and Mr. Humphrey at their word." That is just what past experience teaches us we cannot do.

The budget for 1956 contained a lump-sum unallocated reduction of \$1,750,000,000 in the Defense section which was precisely labeled as an anticipatory savings which the Defense Secretary could not pinpoint and allocate but which he felt could be accomplished during the period covered by that budget. Of course, this unusual item served to discount budget totals by \$1¾ billion. But what were the results? In that budget, defense spending was shown at \$35,750,000,000, discounted by the unallocated reduction to arrive at an even \$34 billion. Actual defense spending in 1956 turned out to be \$35,791,000,000—the \$1,750,000,000 unallocated reduction vanished along with \$41 million additional. And this happened in a budget area consuming more than half of the budget and almost universally recognized as a source of tremendous waste and extravagance.

And now, Mr. Chairman, let me take time to answer these gentlemen who are always coming in here and excusing themselves by saying they did not have the necessary data—that they had no means of investigation—that they needed investigators.

Mr. Chairman, under our system of investigation which has been in effect for many years and which was devised in collaboration with Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, and which uses many General Accounting Office FBI men—no member of the Committee on Appropriations has ever asked for an investigation which he did not get and which was made by the most experienced and best trained men in the world. I make that statement advisedly. No member has ever asked for information which was not submitted in detail and in written form.

None of our investigators have permanent places on the payroll of the Committee or the House. Two of them remain for 2 years, the first year as Assistant Director and the second year as Director. The remainder are taken from Federal agencies long enough to participate in one investigation, are transferred to the Committee payroll at the same salary received in the Department and as soon as the investigation is completed are removed from the Committee payroll and returned to their own office.

The advantages of the system are:

First. It is economical. The employees are on the House payroll only as long as needed. If a permanent staff were employed the entire force would be drawing salaries whether the committee was conducting an investigation or not. But under this system a man is called from the Department and placed on the House roll, at the same salary he is drawing in his present position. As soon as the assignment is completed he is returned to

the Department and goes off the House roll and back to his original roll. His salary cannot be raised by the committee and he is not paid a day longer than required for the assignment.

Second. Men especially qualified for the particular investigation involved are secured. In some investigations an auditor is needed, in some a lawyer, in some a chemist, in some an efficiency expert, in some a detective, and so forth. Accordingly, the man best fitted for the assignment is requisitioned. If an auditor is needed the General Accounting Office may be asked to supply the man. If a chemist, the Bureau of Standards; if a lawyer, the Department of Justice; if a civil-service expert, the Civil Service Commission; if a detective, the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Secret Service of the Treasury Department. By way of rotation auditors are also available from the Army, Navy, SEC, RFC, WPB, OPA, and Tariff Commission, chemists from Agriculture, Treasury, and others, and lawyers from the legal staffs of all departments, and so forth. No other system yet suggested will so promptly and so exactly supply just the precise character of qualification needed for any specific investigation.

Third. The system is elastic. It supplies 1 man or 10 men on short notice. There are 10 subcommittees. If only 2 order an investigation, a half dozen men will suffice. But if all 10, or any considerable number of the 10, simultaneously request investigations, the requisition jumps to 50 or 60 men. Then during vacation, when only 1 or 2 subcommittees are investigating, the number drop again. But for any investigation or number of investigations, this system meets the emergency. It supplies just the number needed and no more—and for the time required—and no longer.

Fourth. The system supplies men of rare qualification. For such investigations the departments assign their best operators. These men are experienced. They are trained. They are tried and tested. They have come up through the ranks. They have demonstrated their fidelity and capacity. There are among them no tyros or amateurs. They are the ablest and most dependable men that are to be secured and incomparably superior to the men to be had by political selection of a permanent House staff. Furthermore, they are active and alert. Men on permanent staffs grow old and inert with the passage of the years, but the departments are a never-failing fountain of youth and energy.

Fifth. The constant change in operatives sends into the departments men unknown and unacquainted in the bureaus which they investigate. They have had no opportunities to establish cordial relations. They are new faces and new brooms—and they sweep clean.

Sixth. The only interest of the operator is to secure the facts as quickly and as economically as possible and get back to his own office. Under the average committee of investigation the employee is likely to be swayed by two dominant interests: First, he wishes to prolong and perpetuate his job. He is drawing a better salary than he can get anywhere else and he wants to make it last as long as

conditions permit. Second, he feels that he must justify his employment by "making his case" and "getting his man."

There is no such incentive under this system. Congressional committees of investigation now operating have expended vast sums—as high as half a million dollars—with little visible results. The Committee on Appropriations conducting investigations in many departments for the larger part of the year has spent less than \$20,000 and secured invaluable results.

Seventh. The system cannot be used for the publicizing or aggrandizement of the chairman or any member of the committee. Requests submitted by the subcommittees are for facts. Opinions are not admitted. The investigators receive written assignments and make written reports, and from those facts reported the members of the committee deduce their own opinions, although the committee may request, through the staff, an analysis of the data by an expert not connected with the original investigation. Results of the investigations are not released to the newspapers. The department which has been investigated does not itself know what the investigator has reported and as a result must be on its toes ready for any development when its representatives appear before the committee in the hearings on the budget estimates.

Eighth. On the other hand, the system cannot be used as an instrument of persecution. The fact that a department is investigated is in no way to its discredit. Investigations are routine and are expected and as a rule welcomed by the departments. While many instances have been reported which justified heavy retrenchments, there have been occasions when on the basis of the reports submitted by the investigator the appropriation was increased over the budget estimate. The system makes for efficient administration as well as economical administration. And it is effective even when not in use. It is like the shotgun behind the door. The very knowledge that it is there is a deterrent—even though not in use. The mere fact that Congress can investigate, and is supplied with effective machinery for investigation, exerts a salutary influence.

On the whole, the system has proven remarkably successful. It has met every requirement. In fact, it is difficult to imagine a system which would be more responsive to our needs and more economical and effective in its operation and results.

The surprising feature of the system is that it has met with no criticism from any source. Every member of the committee, both of the majority and minority, approves of it without reservation. Even the departments which have been investigated uniformly express appreciation of the tact and courtesy with which the investigations have been handled, and have cooperated with the committee. It has not only been comparatively inexpensive but through the information deduced the subcommittees have been able to make material retrenchments.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree more with the gentleman who just preceded me in regard to the need for cutting the budget, but I do believe there is one program we should scrutinize very carefully before accepting the Appropriation Committee's recommendation. I refer particularly to the failure of the committee to include strategic metals in the budget in order to continue a program which was voted last year.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted here with a simple choice. Should we support, for an interim period, a new industry that our Government called into being to meet a strategic metal shortage during the Korean war? Or should we, once again, allow this industry to go out of business leaving us dependent upon the foreign sources which proved so undependable in the recent past?

Prior to the Korean conflict, we had no tungsten industry. When the Korean war broke out, this Nation had to shop all over the world, paying up to \$65 per ton, plus costs of transporting this material to the United States. During this period, the Government encouraged a domestic tungsten industry by guaranteeing a purchase price of \$63 per ton. The encouragement paid off. We are now producing 42 percent of the Nation's tungsten supply.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is only wise to keep this industry going until the President's long range metal program can be considered by Congress. If we abandon this domestic industry now and permit our mines to fill with water, what guaranty have we that in the case of new emergency we will not have to again shop on the world market and be gouged by foreign producers who will charge all the traffic will bear.

It has been said that we now have a stockpile sufficient to meet defense needs.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that anyone in this Government can make such a statement with any assurance that it is accurate. Tungsten is a metal that we are going to consume in ever-increasing quantities as we become more and more dependent upon high-heat energy. Our technology is advancing with such rapidity that we may need and be able to use twice as much tungsten as we now have on hand.

An adequate, healthy domestic tungsten mining industry is the best insurance this Nation has against being victimized on world metal markets by other nations, who, knowing we must have this metal, will boost the price sky high if we become dependent upon their production. The continuation of this program and its relatively minor cost is a small premium to pay for this type of insurance.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss that portion of the report relating to the acquisition of domestic minerals.

In the beginning, I would like to say that I am very unhappy to find myself

in disagreement with my respected friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] the chairman of that subcommittee, and I believe that when the Committee on Appropriations gets the facts before it with respect to this program these funds will be restored. As a matter of fact, the unanimity of the support in the executive branch for this program when it was voted by the Congress last year and the unanimous action of this House and of the Senate in passing this legislation, subsequently signed by the President, leaves me in some mystification as to why now, after the Committee on Appropriations itself appropriated \$21 million last August for this program, it should be peremptorily cut off.

The committee report dealing with this subject matter is on page 11 of the report, and if you have it before you, I would like to call your attention to the second paragraph, which reads as follows:

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization assured the Congress in June 1956 that there was no defense justification for further domestic purchase of any of these four minerals, pointing out—

And so forth.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wish the gentleman would complete the paragraph.

Mr. ENGLE. I will be glad to complete it if the gentleman considers it relevant.

Mr. JENSEN. Please.

Mr. ENGLE. "Pointing out that in each instance the amount on hand and on order met both the minimum and long-term stockpile objectives."

And then he cites the example of tungsten.

Now, the members of this committee might assume from that quotation by Dr. Flemming that he opposed this program, and they might assume, also, except for a careful reading of the statement, that Dr. Flemming's statement is a current one made before the Committee on Appropriations. As a matter of fact, the exact opposite is the truth. Dr. Flemming did not oppose this program, but he supported it. Not only that, but the testimony quoted is not testimony given before the Committee on Appropriations this session but given before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in June of 1956.

The measure, which was reported by the House Committee on Interior and which became Public Law 733 was the subject of House Report 2596 to accompany S. 3982 which is available to the Members. I want to read from page 5 of that report. This is a quotation from the report itself as distinguished from Mr. Flemming's testimony, which I will also read:

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming in recommending that the Congress provide the interim assistance which would be authorized by S. 3982, as amended, cited the recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy and presented a summary of his position, as follows.

And following is a discussion of the recommendations of the President's Cab-

inet Committee on Minerals Policy by Dr. Flemming; and point 4 is as follows:

The Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy also recognized that the development of mineral resources may involve factors beyond the national security.

And Dr. Flemming goes on to say:

As I have already indicated, however, we believe that where a domestic purchase program is about to terminate and where all defense needs have been met, the Congress should make provision beyond the scope of defense legislation to assist the industry by providing for the purchase of specified amounts from nondefense funds until the Congress has had time to consider recommendations from the appropriate nondefense agency for a long-range program.

The long-range program is promised and will be here. He went on to say that

Based on this approach—

This is Dr. Flemming speaking who is quoted on page 11 in the subcommittee report:

Based on this approach, I have taken action necessary to insure the continuance of domestic purchase programs for six minerals under the authority of the Stock Piling Act or the Defense Production Act.

And he names all 6 of them. And they were continued by Executive order. Then he goes on, and I quote him again:

I also recommend that in the case of four minerals: chrysotile asbestos, acid grade fluorspar, tungsten, and columbite-tantalite—for which all defense needs have been met, the Congress provide interim assistance pending consideration by the Congress of a long-range nondefense program.

In other words, Dr. Flemming not only did not oppose this program, he vigorously supported it and recommended it and Assistant Secretary Felix Wormser who is also quoted in this report appeared before our committee and testified as follows:

Failure to provide this readjustment assistance might cause destruction of domestic production capacity necessary to our anticipated future peacetime industrial requirements. Furthermore, failure to enact such a program might well negate the gains that have accrued from the defense-related programs. For these reasons we believe some form of interim Government support during this transitional phase would be proper.

That, of course, was the function of the bill then before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that passed the House and that is here repudiated in this report from the Committee on Appropriations. But that is not all. Along came the Bureau of the Budget, that tightfisted Bureau, and what did it say? And I am quoting now from page 7 of the same report, the statement made by Robert E. Merriam, Assistant to the Director. He says, and this is his language:

Quite quickly, I can say this: That from the standpoint of the Bureau of the Budget, the testimony submitted here this morning by Mr. Wormser and Mr. Flemming does represent our position in these matters. We feel that it is wise to develop an interim program, and we want to emphasize that word "interim," which would tide us over a very difficult situation in those metals where the defense needs have now been met. And we would endorse and subscribe to the

amendments to S. 3982 that were suggested here this morning by Mr. Wormser.

We adopted all of those amendments, and that is the program referred to which was enacted by our committee. The statement in the Appropriations Committee report does not contain new information. This matter was all before the House of Representatives in July of last year.

The fact of the matter is that every executive agency that has had anything to do with this program has supported it. Dr. Flemming supported it notwithstanding the quotation you see in the report. The Interior Department supported it. The Office of Minerals Mobilization supported it. The Bureau of the Budget supported it. The President of the United States supported it by signing the bill.

That is not all. This legislation had such unanimity of support in the Congress that it passed the Senate without a rollcall vote with no opposition whatever from anybody. It came over here to the House of Representatives. We brought it on the floor under suspension of the rules, that requires a two-thirds vote, and no one even raised his voice. There was nothing to say because no one was opposing this legislation.

Following that, the Appropriations Committee appropriated over \$21 million to effectuate this program, to put it into operation. The miners went into production in reliance on the continuance of a program for 18 months that had been voted by Congress after unanimous support from every executive agency involved. Now we find ourselves cut off without a plugged nickel in this urgency appropriation bill, although it was clearly understood when the \$21 million was voted last year that it would not be sufficient. This is a very unusual situation.

Let me deal with one other aspect of the statements made in this report.

The Appropriations Committee report quotes the veto message of August 14, 1955, when the President vetoed H. R. 6373, which would have directed the continuation of existing domestic minerals purchase program. This veto message is presumably quoted in support of the proposition that the present program should be stopped. The fact is that the President favored this legislation and signed the bill S. 3982 which put it into operation. S. 3982, which became Public Law 733, met on an interim basis the objections which the President made in his veto message of August 14, 1955. That is demonstrated by the testimony of Dr. Flemming which appears on page 6 of House Report No. 2596. Dr. Flemming points out that the action taken is not a piecemeal approach to which the President objected. He states in his testimony, which I have previously quoted, that he had taken executive action to continue the domestic purchase program with reference to six minerals—mica, chromite, beryl, manganese, fluorspar, and antimony. And, in order to round out the program, he recommended the enactment of Public Law 733 adding the 4 minerals which had been deprived of funds in this appropriation bill. Our

committee, on page 13 of the same report, points out that it was our purpose to "round out the package program for interim assistance to a number of the important segments of the domestic mining industry."

The Appropriations Committee has now made a piecemeal program out of the situation by striking down 4 of the 10 minerals recommended for continuation in the overall approach to the problem which the President had requested.

The Appropriations Committee's report calls attention to the fact that one of the largest producers got over \$2 million of the money and, according to their information, 9 producers received 87 percent of the funds. If the Members of the House interested in this legislation had been given an opportunity to testify prior to the action taken by the Appropriations Committee, we would have pointed out two facts with reference to this situation.

The first is that most of the small miners do not have processing facilities and, therefore, must process their materials through the bigger operators. Most of the larger operators mentioned in the tabulation, which appears in the Appropriations Committee hearings, actually represented the production also of a large number of small producers. A correct statement of the number of producers participating in this program which I have secured from the General Services Administration, the administering agency for the purchasing of these materials, is as follows:

Public Law 733—As of Jan. 31, 1957

	Number of producers	Short-ton units purchased
Arizona.....	10	3,958
California.....	89	53,236
Colorado.....	17	36,441
Idaho.....	5	17,662
Montana.....	7	31,461
Nevada.....	73	115,399
New Mexico.....	1	22
North Carolina.....	1	24,999
Utah.....	4	155
Washington.....	1	774
Wyoming.....	1	20
Total.....	209	283,424

The above tabulation shows that the number of producers was admittedly less than under the old program, which was in excess of 700, and that brings up the second matter.

The price has been cut from \$63 to \$55, and since the small producers are the highest-cost producers they go out of business first. Additionally, the on-again-off-again way this matter has been handled works great hardship on the small producers, who do not have the financial resources to shut down and start up. But, all of the production of the small producers goes into this program whereas only a portion of the production of the large producers goes into it since there is a limitation of 5,000 units per month. In fact, only 25 percent of the domestic production of tungsten is now handled under the Government purchase program, the balance going into regular channels of trade.

The criticism of the Wha Chang Corporation, which is the largest purchaser

referred to in the last two paragraphs in the Appropriations Committee report, is not only unwarranted but unfair. Wha Chang has two mines in this country in which it has invested over 6 million dollars. This capital investment will not be recaptured even if this program runs the entire period for which it was initiated. Moreover, the Appropriations Committee did not have the facts on the contract of this corporation for foreign tungsten. The contract is for tungsten in Brazil and was entered into during the Korean war. Wha Chang offered to drop the contract but the Government insisted that the contract be completed. At the time the contract was entered into the Government was begging for tungsten, and now Wha Chang finds itself criticized for having a contract entered into during the Korean war which it offered to relinquish but which it was told to perform.

The question before the Congress when this program was authorized last summer was whether or not we wanted to continue the domestic mining program on an interim basis until such time as the executive agencies presented their long-range nondefense domestic mining program to the Congress. As I have previously said, every executive agency involved unanimously supported the continuation of the domestic mining program on an interim basis for that purpose and the bill to do so passed the Congress without any opposition. Additionally, the Appropriations Committee and the Congress approved \$21 million to put the purchase program underway. In other words, the executive agencies and Congress decided that the domestic mining industry should be continued on an interim basis and provided a portion of the funds.

Now the Appropriations Committee has redeeded the matter and intends to veto the action taken by Congress last August by refusing to provide any further funds. We feel that this is manifestly unfair to the mining industry which made its investments, reopened its mines and proceeded to continue to produce in reliance upon Public Law 733 and the initial appropriation which was made.

The long-range domestic mining program is presently being prepared in the executive branch. Secretary Seaton promised to bring up such a program when he was confirmed as Secretary of the Interior, and, as recently as last fall in his speech in Los Angeles, agreed to present a long-range domestic, non-defense mining program to Congress in this session. I am in hopes that with full understanding of this matter the Appropriations Committee will restore these funds thus keeping the commitment which Congress made when Public Law 733 was passed, and continue the domestic mining industry on an interim basis until such time—certainly not longer than the period for which this program was set up—as Congress will need to enact, if it thinks wise, the long-range domestic mining program which is finally submitted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations I want to explain a few things about this item.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KIRWAN. May I say this to the ranking member of the subcommittee? We did not give them the \$20 million last year. On the evidence that was given us last year we kicked it out. We did not give them a quarter.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. KIRWAN. It went over to the Senate where they put it in. We took it out in conference. When it went back on the Senate floor, the Senate would not accept it. We did not give them the \$20 million at all, as the gentleman said we did.

Mr. JENSEN. I am happy that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations has spoken on this matter. The justification before the committee was very weak and unconvincing. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] agree?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; they did not have the proper justifications. Then, referring to the other body again—the gentleman said there was no opposition on the floor there. Senator WILLIAMS and Senator DWORSHAK pounded on this right along. The testimony shows in the hearings that it was Senator DWORSHAK. In fact, some people called me yesterday and made this statement. They are the largest outfit in the country. They said, "You are putting us out of business." I said, "How? Why I thought you were one of the largest steel corporations." But it is their tungsten mines. I said, "Do you buy your own tungsten?" They said, "Oh, no, we sell it to the Government." In other words, for their own use, they buy tungsten at \$33 a short ton anywhere in the country, but in mining it they sell it to the United States Government for \$55 a ton.

Mr. JENSEN. The American taxpayer pays those companies a neat profit of \$22 a ton.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; around \$20 a ton.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, to clinch this argument and to answer the gentleman from California, for whom I have the highest regard, he simply just does not have the information that he should have had to make the speech which he just made. Mr. Wormser, Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources for the Department of the Interior, said before the other body on May 25, 1956, that "some continued assistance is needed in the case of tungsten and asbestos to minimize economic dislocations and permit adjustment to competitive markets."

He testified further:

In my opinion, continuing Government subsidization of the mining of submarginal ores in peacetime will weaken rather than strengthen the domestic mining industry.

In conclusion, he said:

It is my Department's recommendation that the Government not embark upon a program to subsidize in peacetime the mining of submarginal ores. Such action would not only be in conflict with our free-enter-

prise economy, but over the long term cannot be expected to yield the benefits to be derived from a more basic approach to the development of our natural resources as recommended by the Cabinet Committee and being put into effect in the manner I have indicated. We therefore recommend that each purchase program be brought to an orderly close when the material involved is no longer needed for defense.

The facts are that the Department of Defense has 5 years' supply of most of these strategic materials on hand and in stockpile at the present time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the action of the Appropriations Committee in recommending to the House in this urgent deficiency appropriation bill of 1957 that no funds be permitted to implement the provisions of the domestic tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum production and purchase bill of 1956 for the last months of fiscal 1957. I hesitate—momentarily—to voice my opposition, not because I have doubts as to the validity of this program thus cut to nothing, but rather because I do not wish to dull the zealous desire of the committee to reduce Federal expenditures wherever it can be done without materially and permanently injuring some necessary segment of our national economy.

We have information from many sources, including both the President and his Secretary of the Treasury, that Federal expenditures are too high—this notwithstanding the fact that the budget recommendations of the President are consistently cut by the House. I have never been one to urge spending just for the sake of spending. It is now quite obvious that spending is a habit of political administrations not confined to any one political party, as was so often alleged not too long ago.

However, I would be derelict in my duty of representation to our people and to my colleagues if I did not oppose the termination of a sound legislative program by appropriation action alone. Just last July 13, this House gave its approval, under suspension of the rules, to S. 3982, as amended. This bill, the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956, had been approved by the Senate, was reapproved as amended and was then signed into law by the President on July 19, 1956, as Public Law 733. That was July of last year, just 7 months ago. Funds to implement this newly enacted program were requested and provided for in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1957. Let me again repeat, the program and the funds for the program were approved by both Houses of Congress and by the President.

With the funds so allowed, the General Services Administration, as the designated purchasing agency of the Department of the Interior, established the necessary purchase programs. The appropriation of 21 millions was known at that time to be less than required for the operation of the program throughout fiscal 1957. It was expected and ad-

mitted that a request for additional funds would be included in the first deficiency bill this year. All parties, both governmental and private, had every reason to assume that a program approved by the Congress and the President in July and supported by the administrative agencies, would have a life equal to its authorized time. Such now appears to be impossible because this program has been struck down—wiped out—finished—by the Appropriations Committee.

I realize that the Appropriations Committee can and should stand on its merit and that it is not, and should not be, the mere rubber stamp of either the legally constituted authorizing or jurisdictional committees, or of administrative agencies. Still, legislative enactment, with its attendant expression of policy, must be more than a passing whim. Laws must be more than mere ruffles to decorate the labors of the standing committees of the House, or of the Congress itself. Honest and enterprising citizens, operating under legislative enactment, must have something more than mere hope that a law enacted in July to run for 18 months will, at least, outlast the first chill blast of the following January.

The respective Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the two Houses of Congress are able and conscientious committees; their membership is equal in dedication to our economic well-being to that of any other committee in Congress. They do not promote grab-bag legislation which must be struck down before it has run its planned course.

What actually is this legislation that has here been cut down? It has a long history, but apparently is still not well understood even by the experienced and learned members of the most powerful committee of the House. When the Korean emergency hit this Nation in its economic solar plexus it found us, as usual, unprepared on the mineral front. Long and valiant battles by the mining industry had improved somewhat the boom and bust, feast and famine policy which we have had so long for minerals, but we were still unprepared for the dangers confronting us, so far as minerals were concerned. Hostilities in Korea did more than create the drain. The tide of battle itself cost us an important source of tungsten, a vital and strategic mineral. South Korea was an important source of supply of tungsten. Yet the battle cut it off. Above the ground campaign roared the first jets in air combat, and with the need for jets came a zooming demand for high temperature materials—and that meant, and still means, tungsten.

In the usual and ordinary course, the Government set out to do by yesterday what the mining industry had urged as wise and necessary procedure on a long-term peacetime basis—that is, secure both a stockpile and a sure domestic source for an emergency. They did not succeed by yesterday, but success did come. Overseas suppliers of these vital materials, including tungsten, again charged all that the traffic would bear for ever shorter supplies of needed goods. Our Government again entered into most generous contracts with overseas sup-

pliers, both for development and for purchase of material from existing concerns. The Government also saw fit to provide a domestic program for many materials, less generous to be sure, but at least something for the home folks. At that time, I might add, all expert opinion ran to the conclusion that it was quite impossible to develop a domestic tungsten industry in the continental United States since our surveys indicated that we did not have commercial tungsten deposits. As it always happens, success brought disaster for domestic producers, or at least disaster was waiting at the door until the Congress extended the domestic purchase program with the Domestic Minerals Extension Act of 1953, which extended these purchases for 2 years.

It is true that the President vetoed H. R. 6373 of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, a bill which would have provided funds to carry these programs to their stated termination dates. This is indicated in the hearings of the bill before us. These hearings also indicate that certain objections to this program were once voiced by the Office of Defense Mobilization. However, equally important, and perhaps more important, are subsequent events which were not brought out in the hearings had this year by the Appropriations Committee on this bill.

These events are well covered in House Report No. 2596, filed by the House Interior Committee in reporting S. 3982 last year. Statements of such positions are found on pages 5 and 6 of the report, that is, House Report No. 2596. The Director of ODM, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, in testifying before the Senate Interior Committee on S. 3982, brought out the facts alluded to in the hearings on the bill before us. However, he went on from there to state that additional developments in the administration, including a study by a policy committee and the Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy, had forced the conclusion that interim action was needed until a long-term program could be adopted. This interim program is the one now cut out and it was this program which was to sustain certain minerals programs even where defense and stockpile needs had been met. It was upon this recommendation, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, that the Congress passed S. 3982 last July, a program to sustain operations in tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum until a long-term, nondefense industry could be established.

Events since that time, last July, have advanced this schedule. Mr. Felix Wormser, Assistant Secretary, Mineral Resources of the Department of the Interior, in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee this year, stated that the long-awaited, long-term minerals program is about to be born. Having approved an interim program for a vital industry in prospect of this development, we should not now kill it just when the purpose it was to serve is so close to reality.

Concern is expressed in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee that some larger producers seem to be obtaining the most benefit from this purchase program. This is not a valid criti-

cism; rather it is a compliment. Recall, we were supposed to be a "have not" Nation in tungsten. These enterprising men have merely established the fact that we are not. They have gone out and developed these resources—which is precisely what was desired in the Defense Production Act of 1950, the extension in 1953, and the interim program passed just last July. That desire was to find and establish a domestic source of this vital metal. Are we to penalize them for success?

It should also be noted that in these operations, the large and small live and die together. The larger operator furnishes the milling and refining facility to which the small operator sends his ore. Without the larger producer and his mill, the small operator would have nothing. Thus, I know for a fact that some of the larger operators reported in the hearings as receiving substantial sums under this program are obligated to pass much of this on to small operators with whom they have marketing arrangements. They receive, process, and market the ore under lease or contract and must make payment for such supply to the producer. Additionally, it can be shown that the availability of a processing facility and the market furnished by this program has brought into production mines which can and will stand on their own just as soon as heavy development costs have been written off and when the now large supply of overseas ores, largely the result of action by this Government, resumes its more normal size. It was expected that many small producers would fall by the wayside in this stabilizing program.

I cannot believe that the Congress will one day encourage men to begin a mining operation, encourage them to risk their capital, hire workers, and establish processing facilities, and then turn the next day and say, "Boys, we are sorry, but we did not mean what we said. You just take your losses, close down your mines, fire your workers, and let this whole thing go to rack and ruin." Yet this is what is happening already in this program since funds ran out in December. If we do not approve the requested funds for this program for the balance of fiscal 1957, the months from December through July, we will be abrogating a legislative promise upon which men have risked much. We cannot do this in good conscience. The Government has no special option to play fast and loose with either its promises or its citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my remarks have been constructive. I realize that many do not believe in spending funds to sustain domestic mineral industries, yet the record of yesterday clearly shows the great cost to our Nation of our inaction in this field. We have, by these emergency programs, now established the rudiments of a domestic tungsten industry, and this in the face of the fact that we were supposed to be a have not Nation in this vital material. Given something like an even break, these hardy minerals enterprisers, who somehow sustain hope in spite of governmental policies which one day encourage, the next day discourage, will establish a

sound tungsten program. They will establish an industry that will provide employment for many workers, provide a sure source of this vital mineral with its irreplaceable heat resistant qualities, prevent price gouging in future emergency, and prove a wise investment to the Nation.

It follows that what I have said applies equally to many other metals and minerals. What we have that is our own, we can depend on in emergency or normalcy. What we develop and build in our own Nation, we get the return from. We do not live in a world so settled and peaceful that we can ignore the wise and efficient development and use of our sources of tungsten, of asbestos, of fluor-spar or of many other vital strategic materials.

Mrs. FOST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mrs. FOST. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague for the fine, factual, and constructive statement he is making this afternoon. I would like to associate myself with his remarks and those of my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply worried as I contemplate here today the complete thwarting of this Nation's domestic minerals program.

It was only last June that Congress enacted Public Law 733. Today the urgent deficiency appropriation bill has been presented to us without the funds necessary to carry out the law we enacted last session. Everything that Congress last year promised thousands upon thousands of miners and their families has gone down the drain.

How in the world, Mr. Chairman, do you go about explaining to mine owners, miners and their hungry families that the word Congress gave them last June can be so blithely broken the following February.

In my State of Idaho there are two principal producers and five smaller producers of tungsten. Their 1955 production totalled 38,520 short ton units of tungsten trioxide, which was sold to the Government for more than \$2 million. Presumably because of interruptions in the Government purchasing programs the production went down approximately 15 percent in 1956. By the end of last November there was only one producer still operating in Idaho.

You can see why I am disturbed today. I am also fearful that if the philosophy expounded in this report is allowed to stand the farm price program or the agricultural barter program will be its next victim.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will have the vision, the courage, and the sense of rightness and justice, to correct this wrong by restoring the domestic minerals purchase program item in this urgency deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I simply wanted to make the statement at this point that we find ourselves today com-

mitted to a long-term contract at approximately \$65 per unit from foreign sources. This tungsten is being supplied under contracts that we entered into back at a time when we had to have this metal. Now it is costing \$35 a ton as a result of the Government's program in supporting production of this metal. If we curtail the program then the price will go back up and we will be forced to go into foreign markets again to augment our own supply.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct; and, of course, if it had not been that we were able to get business entrepreneurs to come in to keep the domestic program going we would not have had the supply of domestic tungsten that we have at the present time, as the gentleman recognizes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. GRAY. I compliment the gentleman on his excellent statement. The gentleman, however, has failed to mention the great unemployment that is going to result if this program is curtailed. This means it will cost the Government more because of the added expenditures the Government will have to make by way of relief payments. I know what would happen in my own district where we produce 50 percent of domestic fluor-spar. Five hundred men are employed in that operation. That is something Congress should take into consideration in this connection.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman's statement of course, is correct.

It is not to the credit of the United States to close such a program as this and cause unemployment when the authorizing legislation has led them to believe it would be continued for an 18-month period.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

This is an excellent example of just what happens when we attempt to reduce Government expenditures.

Here is a program with which most of us in the Congress agree. The purpose of the law which was reported out by the House Committee on the Interior last year is excellent, but the question now is, Does the record of administration in its application justify the continuation of the expenditures as they have been made? If we cannot cut the expenditures in a field such as this, if we cannot reduce the President's budget in this instance, then certainly our overall picture for reductions in this session of Congress is almost nil.

This is what happened: The purpose of this legislation—and the purpose was excellent—was to encourage the development of tungsten mines by small miners throughout the United States. The testimony was that some 700 small miners would participate in such program if the Congress would institute it. It is a laudable purpose, but what happened?

From the Department records 43 producers participated in the program, and 9 of those got 87 percent of the amount appropriated. In every instance each of those nine producers was one of the big mining corporations of this country. For example, I note in the figures that were furnished the committee by the Department that Union Carbide received approximately \$2 million from the \$21 million which has already been spent on this program. I also notice in this morning's paper that the Union Carbide Co. announced in New York this morning its plans to build a building to house its offices on Park Avenue between 47th and 48th Streets in the city of New York at a cost of \$47 million. If these funds had been used for the intended purpose, or if the legislation will be corrected by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs so that the funds can be expended for the very laudable purpose which he intended, then I am sure the Appropriations Committee will be very sympathetic toward his cause.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to the gentleman that that is the trouble with this kind of procedure. You do not get a chance to talk enough to get the facts before the House. The report before the Committee is not correct. The total number of producers is 209. In 1957 the total units of production were 283,424 as compared with 793 producers and 2,996,451 units under the previous law. Admittedly the program has been cut about a third. We expected that when we cut the price. But the small producers have since been squeezed out.

We would like a chance, when a program so vital to the West is before the Appropriations Committee, to have the opportunity to get our two-bits worth in before the Committee acts, but we were not afforded that opportunity.

Mr. BUDGE. The gentleman stated a few minutes ago that the Appropriations Committee approved this appropriation item in the last session. The fact of the matter is the budget item came too late and was sent directly to the Senate. The House Appropriations Committee had no opportunity to act on it in the last session of the Congress. The item was inserted in the Senate; it was taken out in the first conference. A compromise sum was agreed on in the second conference between the two bodies.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on his statement to begin with, then may I say I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] that there must be some confusion because he alleges that the program should be based on helping a peacetime industry. I understood the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] to say it was based on wartime needs. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] stated we were being gouged by the foreigners at \$65 a ton, yet the purchases under this pro-

gram amount to \$63 a ton. I think the committee is right when it suggests that this program be set aside and perhaps over a long period of time be reconsidered.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman. That is what I am suggesting to the chairman and the membership of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; that is, that the legislation be corrected to accomplish its original purpose.

Let me cite another instance. A corporation named Wah Chang has headquarters in the Woolworth Building, New York City. Wah Chang received \$2,800,000 out of this program. At the same time it is producing tungsten in other areas of the world and also selling it to the United States Government. Wah Chang also has the beneficiation plant located near New York City for the processing of tungsten. The figures which our staff was able to get in the short time available to them showed that Wah Chang processes the major portion of all the tungsten produced in the free world. I would like to reiterate that the purpose of this legislation is excellent. No one wants more than I to assure ourselves of a proper and adequate production of the minerals and metals in this country so that when they are needed we will have them at our finger tips. On the other hand, I see absolutely no justification for the Government of the United States collecting from the taxpayers of the United States money with which to subsidize the Union Carbide Co., Wah Chang Corp., and the other 7 producers who received 87 percent of the tungsten allocation of the \$21 million appropriated and who would get 87 percent of the additional \$30 million if the Congress saw fit to appropriate it at this time.

The remedy lies with the legislative committee. It should correct the legislation which it wrote, then the Appropriations Committee would be very happy to implement it with appropriations which can be used for the purpose originally intended. If we are to request assistance from the Federal Government for the preservation and development of our domestic mines, and particularly our small miners, we must be able to present a better record of accomplishment than has been presented in this instance.

I repeat that the intent of the legislation is excellent and if what I consider to have been abuses can be eliminated, then funds should be requested.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak on this important subject matter of stockpiling domestic minerals, but it has been so completely covered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] that I will ask unanimous consent at this point to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, a very grave and serious matter is before this House. I refer to the proposed appropriation which would have permitted the

continued operation of our acid-grade fluorspar, our tungsten, columbium-tantalum, and asbestos mines. Why do I say this is a grave matter? These are producers of strategic and critical defense minerals—they are essential to our defense needs and vital to our domestic economy. Yet today we propose to destroy them; that will be the direct result of our refusal to continue the program approved by the last session of Congress, and in so doing, we propose to become wholly dependent upon foreign sources for our supply of these critical raw materials.

In my district over 50 percent of our national supply of acid-grade fluorspar is produced. That industry, already terribly depressed, will cease to exist on April 15, the termination date of the present contracts, under Public Law 733, unless we provide additional funds. These then unemployed miners will be added to the 35,000 already unemployed miners in my district.

Consider for a moment the current experiments being conducted in the field of rocket propulsion by our Armed Forces. One of the propellants being tested is liquid fluorine—obtained wholly from acid-grade fluorspar.

We have been advised by the experts in our atomic energy program that an adequate source of supply of acid-grade fluorspar is as essential for our atomic energy program as a supply of uranium. Yet today we propose to destroy our domestic source of supply.

Without an adequate and constant supply of acid-grade fluorspar, our aluminum industry would cease operation immediately. Acid-grade fluorspar is indispensable to the production of aluminum.

Hydrofluoric acid cannot be produced without acid-grade fluorspar. This chemical ingredient is the base on which our entire chemical industry rests.

Research in fluorine chemistry, being pursued by the industry with more vigor and showing more promise than any other research promise in the chemical field, is wholly dependent upon a supply of acid-grade fluorspar. This research indicates that by the substitution or exchange of the fluorine element in the hydrocarbon compounds we will have paints and plastics as well as lubricating oils that cannot burn or be destroyed by heat. In the vital field of national health, acid-grade fluorspar is being used in our drinking water and in our toothpaste as the most effective ingredient ever devised to prevent tooth decay.

I would like to refer to the report which has been filed on this bill. In that report it is indicated that our defense requirements for these minerals have been met. I would first like to point out that the statement concerning our defense requirements was made by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. I do not need to remind this body that those requirements are based on last year's estimates; in view of the new uses visualized for these materials who among us can say that last year's requirements are sufficient for today or will be adequate for tomorrow. Even the Office of Defense Mobilization revises these requirements

estimates annually. The risk involved in assuming that we are safe and protected by having met yesterday's requirements is so fraught with danger that I shudder to think of the possible consequences of proceeding on such a dangerous promise. And, in the case of acid-grade fluorspar almost 90 percent, so I am advised of the stockpile requirements have been filled by foreign producers at prices up to \$65 per ton—while our own domestic mines were closed, our miners unemployed. The present program calls for a payment of \$53 per ton for domestic producers, far below what we have paid our foreign suppliers. With our domestic producers destroyed by our failure to continue the present program what will be the price we will pay our foreign producers to meet the inevitable expanded stockpile requirements? It has been my observation that foreign producers, once they have obtained domination of our domestic market, seldom show any consideration in exacting their toll from the domestic consumer, be he a private or Government purchaser. And who can say that foreign supplies will be available, regardless of the cost, when we are confronted with a dire emergency or even to meet expanded stockpile requirements.

My second observation on the committee report is this: Again referring to the statement of Dr. Flemming of ODM on the fact that our stockpile requirements have been met and that there is no present defense justification for this program. I was sufficiently interested in the statement to obtain a complete copy of it. I believe it will be of interest to you to learn that there is considerably more to Dr. Flemming's statement. In the very same statement Dr. Flemming recommended that the Congress enact Public Law 733. The report neglects to furnish this illuminating bit of information. But I want this body to be fully informed and to know that even though Dr. Flemming testified as shown in the report, he further stated that and I quote from the record:

The Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy also recognized that the development of mineral resources may involve factors beyond the national security. It stated that—

In addition to security considerations, the Committee believes that an orderly development and wise use of the Nation's resources is an essential element in a strong and sound economy.

A major objective of mineral policy is a full and orderly program for the development and conservation of the country's mineral resources.

The Committee believes that the Government has an obligation to assure that the mineral resources of the Nation be developed, conserved, and utilized in the best possible manner over the longest possible period in order to enhance its security and commerce. Development of mineral resources is, of course, primarily a function of private enterprise. The Government must, however, continue to assist in many ways.

Thus the Minerals Policy Committee recognized that there may be nondefense problems in the minerals industries and, therefore, that, as is evident later in the report, these problems are beyond the scope of the Office of Defense

Mobilization as a defense agency. I suggest, however, that where a domestic purchase program is about to terminate and where all defense needs have been met, the Congress should make provision beyond the scope of defense legislation to assist the industry by providing for the purchase of specified amounts from nondefense funds until the Congress has had time to consider recommendations from the appropriate nondefense agency, namely, the Department of Interior, for a long-range program.

I also recommend that in the case of three minerals: chrysotile asbestos, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten—for which all defense needs have been met, the Congress pass such legislation and appropriate such funds as it deems necessary to provide interim assistance pending consideration by the Congress of a long-range nondefense program.

Thus, gentlemen, Dr. Flemming did not, as the report indicates, oppose this measure but rather he strongly urged its enactment. I am unable to accept any philosophy other than that proposed by Dr. Flemming. I have the utmost confidence in his judgment; and I am equally confident in his unswerving devotion to the cause of the strongest possible American defense; one that rests squarely on an adequate supply of raw materials and particularly critical and strategic minerals from United States sources. That is a policy on which we can never go wrong.

Consider the significance of the few illustrations given above, gentlemen, and ones which could be enlarged. Are we prepared to say that these vital defense industries as well as our health program are to become wholly dependent upon foreign sources of supply for their fluorine? Where do our imports, upon which we will be forced to rely, originate? Italy, Sardinia, Spain, France, Germany, Newfoundland and Mexico; thousands of miles away, and in every case except one, across the wide, and as history has repeatedly shown, nearly defenseless sea lanes; in the case of Mexico the productive capacity of that nation is approximately one-fourth of our present domestic consumptive requirements. Our domestic sources of supply all within the United States are in some cases within 50 miles of the consumption point. Which would be easier to defend and certain of access, supplies thousands of miles overseas or those in our own country on the doorsteps of our consuming industries? Who can guarantee us that all of the foreign sources of supply will remain available to us and be in friendly hands when we most urgently need them? No one. Have we not just recently witnessed the near collapse of the economy of Britain and France, in peacetime, due to their dependence upon foreign sources for a fuel supply? Is this lesson to be so completely overlooked in such a short time? Are we not now embarking upon a similar course?

Or, should we, as decided by the last Congress, permit these vital and strategic mining industries to continue to operate until a long-range minerals policy shall have been developed? That, gentlemen, seems to me to be a far wiser

and certainly the only safe course for us to follow.

This present program is but an interim one. If a long-range program were enacted tomorrow, the present program would cease to operate. But, think of the benefits we will have obtained by its operation and its assurance of a continuity of availability of these minerals. These domestic mines so vital to our national security and economy would have been in operation and their products available if needed. The products produced by them would be safely held in the storehouse of our Government; refined and ready for use yesterday, today, tomorrow, or hundreds of years from now—whenever needed, for they are not subject to decay, erosion, or deterioration.

Do we dare to deliberately destroy our domestic sources of supply for strategic and critical minerals? Do we propose to become wholly dependent upon foreign sources for the supply of our strategic and critical minerals when there is no reason to do so. Are we ready to give to foreign nations absolute control of the vital raw materials for our atomic energy program, our rocket fuels, our aluminum and chemical industries? Yet such is the inevitable result of the course we embarked upon today. I for one refuse to follow this course which surely and inevitably will imperil our national security and our national economy, and I urge you to join with me to protect and preserve our domestic, strategic, and critical mines, and in turn provide for our national security and protect our national economy.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation, if I may, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], on the floor a few minutes ago, made the statement that he thought the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was derelict in his duty in not trying to cut down expenditures.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not think the gentleman heard what I said. I did not say he was derelict. I asked him what he was going to do about it.

Mr. GRAY. I think if you check the record, the gentleman said he had not done his duty.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I said he had not, and I asked him what he was going to do.

Mr. GRAY. Well, "derelict" and "not doing his duty" are the same thing. I do not want to argue with the gentleman, but in this one appropriation bill I want to tell him how it affects my district. We have 50 percent of the domestic fluorspar production in my congressional district. By cutting out all of the \$30 million allowed in this request, you are going to close every fluorspar mine in my district, throwing out of work about 500 workers, which means that the unemployment roll in southern Illinois will be about 30,500 instead of 30,000.

In addition to that, in this bill they are putting a limitation on the administrative cost of administering public aid

in Illinois and the other States, which means that public-aid recipients are going to suffer. So, I say in answer to the gentleman from Missouri that in just two items you are going to affect the welfare of hundreds of people in southern Illinois, particularly those who need help the most, the laboring man and the unemployed man. So, I say in defense of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations: if he had done any more cutting, we would all be out of work in southern Illinois.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Where does the gentleman figure any money goes to Illinois? I was looking at page 14 of the hearings, and I see no item there that would go to anyone in the gentleman's district or in Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Is the gentleman referring to the domestic stockpiling program?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. That shows that the report is not conclusive, for the simple reason that there is nothing stated in that report that has to do with fluorspar and so forth, unless you look at the bottom, and you find there the payments made to fluorspar, one-half of which in the United States is produced in Mr. GRAY's district, as he stated.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is under the heading "Colorado."

Mr. ASPINALL. Colorado produces the other 50 percent.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It has Colorado listed. That is why I am asking where Illinois comes into the picture.

Mr. GRAY. I might state to the gentleman that the report is very incomplete; that we have been selling to the Government from our mines in southern Illinois, and if we do not get more money on April 15 all mines will be forced to close in southern Illinois.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The Chairman. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

DOMESTIC MINERAL PROGRAM

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, during the past 2 days I have received a number of wires and letters from Montana concerning the domestic minerals program, and more particularly the plight of the people of Montana who mine tungsten.

In my State, employment can make or break a community where mining is the principal industry. That now is the unhappy prospect for around 100 men, whose labor has made Montana the third principal producer of tungsten.

Domestic mining development of strategic minerals must be protected against distant foreign production.

I believe we must give every consideration to completion of a projected program of domestic minerals purchase

promised by the 84th Congress as outlined in Public Law 733.

I thank you.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I asked the gentleman to yield so that I could respond to the statement made by my friend from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], that 87 percent of the appropriation spent out of the \$21 million appropriated last August went to 9 producers. The fact is that these larger producers, such as Union Carbide, process material for the smaller fellows and as a consequence they do not show in the receipt of the checks. That is why, when I presented the actual number of participants, it was 202 producers rather than the 47 shown in the committee report.

Mr. BARING. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of the arguments presented by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and others here today who have defended the minerals program so excellently. I, too, hate to take argument with my good friend from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], but he made the remark, as I heard it, that nobody came before the committee to present the case of the stockpiling program. Mr. ENGLE has already told the Congress that we from the Rocky Mountain mineral area were expecting to be called before the Appropriations Committee. I called the Committee on Appropriations a week before this action came up for information and a clerk of that committee—not a Congressman but a clerk, told me that they were not allowed to give information out until the full committee met. Consequently our whole western group was meeting last Friday afternoon, the 1st of February, in preparation for our meeting with the Committee on Appropriations Monday afternoon when we heard that this bill was already printed and the committee report completed. We all felt aghast for we had not been informed that such action would take place before we had a chance to appear before the Appropriations Committee. In fact, Congressman CARL DURHAM, of the Armed Services Committee and Congressman ENGLE, chairman of the Interior Committee were scheduled to talk before that body at that time. We considered this quite a piece of railroading and rough shodding.

I want to inform the Congress that tungsten is one of the most important minerals in America today. The gentleman from Ohio made the remark that we have a 5-year supply on hand. Now, think back a month ago, when the President of the United States stood before this body and told us of the very pressing world conditions existing today and how earnest he was that the Congress should grant him powers unheard of before this, due to the crisis at hand. Now, how can anybody say "how much" is "too much" or that any supply is too much. This is more than I can understand. When you

put a jet motor up into the air it lasts about 100 hours under present conditions. Tests show now that with a little more tungsten it will last that much longer. It will make the metal that much harder, it can resist that much more heat, and can go that much faster because the tungsten increases the tensile strength of the alloy.

We do not know what is ahead of us. The Committee on Armed Services and the various testing laboratories has proven that tungsten is one of the most important minerals in America today. If our sealanes are ever cut we will not be able to get these cheap foreign-mined minerals which it appears this country has always relied on. We in the West know that we have these metals there, and that our mines should be developed, a stockpile made, and the mines kept in good condition, because mines are not made over night, and take at least 3 or 4 years in the making. We have to have a healthy domestic mine program going. That is our first line of defense. I come from the West, where I have seen mines fill with water, and you can never get them opened up again after that. It is the time now for Congress to take action and reinstate this appropriation to complete this program so that we may have a domestic production. I, for one, am sick of the point 4, under which we are legislating not just a mere \$30 million, as we are asking for now, but billions into the development of mines in foreign countries. This might be a popular program with some people, but it is not right. We should protect our own first.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARING. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. Of course, all we can do on the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee in most instances is to rely upon the figures which are furnished the committee by the Government agency responsible for the program. On page 14 we have set forth, in answer to the comments of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. ENGLE] the information which was given us by the Department. And I submit that the Department also told us that in order to police the restrictions which are in the bill, no single producer shall contract for more than 5,000 units per month, of necessity the Department must check into each individual company, and this is the list as furnished us.

Mr. BARING. That is just the point I wanted to bring out, Mr. BUDGE, that the committee in their report has used figures erroneously given them and information that is not pertinent at this time. I call your attention to page 12 of the committee report in which it states that it was contended that about 700 domestic producers might benefit from this program—only 49 producers have participated. I also want to call your attention to the real figures in the case which show that just 4 States, Arizona, California, Idaho, and Nevada, with 675 producers in all, participated in and produced 808,501 short-ton units previous to the recent shutdown in No-

vember. In comparison to this figure, since the shutdown in the 4 States only 170 produced a total of only 160,367 short-ton units. This shows that the intent of Congress to stimulate the small producers was not accomplished, and bear in mind, that this is just for 4 States. The fact that only 49 producers as named by the committee, participated, is attributed to the fact that these are large custom mills to which the small man sends his mineral ore. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a grave mistake on the part of the Appropriations Committee to take this appropriation out when it actually affects our national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, before we pass from general debate into a reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule, I am going to take you out of the field of minerals for a moment, because I have a little problem on my hands, at least in my State and I think the same problem exists in other States.

I should like to make an inquiry of my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and his subcommittee regarding an item I find on page 10 of the report dealing with grants to States for public assistance. I have a telegram here and before the day is over I should like to learn just what happened in connection with the cut that was made in this item. This telegram I think has been sent to most of the members of the delegation and it reads as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., February 4, 1957.

Hon. ROY W. WIER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Have just learned House Appropriations Committee approve placing ceiling on public assistance administrative costs. This would sharply reduce our administrative funds at a time when we are trying to assist Minnesota counties in meeting their rising administrative costs. This bill is known as urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1957. Chapter 3 of this bill headed grants to States carries this ceiling.

We strongly oppose closed end appropriations and hope that you and your colleagues will not act to reduce administrative funds available to Minnesota and other States.

MORRIS HURSH,
Commissioner.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that we attempted to and did cut \$2 million from a total of \$101 million now being spent for administrative costs. Since 1950 administrative costs have risen from \$57,281,000 to \$104,500,000. During that time the average monthly caseload has risen from only 3,405,000 to 3,485,000.

Something has to be done to stop this rising cost of administration, and I do not know any way to do it other than simply not to appropriate the money. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] showed at the time we were holding these hearings that the administrative cost were about 8 percent. Natu-

rally, the folks back home that are getting this money for administering this service do not complain about it because they are not so concerned about administrative costs as we must be if we do our duty. But unless we do something about it, what are we going to do about this budget?

The recipients are not going to suffer at all. This does not take away a penny from the money that goes to the recipients.

Mr. WIER. I understand that.

Mr. LANHAM. However, this does make an effort to cut down on the administrative costs. I do not know how else we are ever going to cut this budget.

Mr. WIER. Let me reply to my good friend from Georgia that I am sure he is well aware that throughout our deliberations of the many items of the President's \$71 billion budget we must remember and recognize that every year there is a continually increasing cost of government, whether it is on the township, county, State, or Federal Government level.

Mr. LANHAM. Unless we just quit furnishing the money, how are we going to cut it?

Mr. WIER. I am just saying the application ought to be made in a general way rather than to single out the funds that are used for the administration of old-age assistance. If you apply that same formula to the foreign-aid program, to the military program, and to some more, I will go along with you, but I must resist this cut because of our longtime obligations under this program to the States and possessions of the Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I say in reply to the gentleman from Minnesota that I am also a member of that subcommittee—Foreign Aid—and I can assure him we will attempt to cut the administrative costs there. We cut the total foreign aid last year a total of about half a billion dollars, and we made it stick over in the Senate. So we just have to take this thing piecemeal. When these problems are before us we have to try to cut here, and let the others take care of themselves.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLLAND. This cut in the cost in Pennsylvania is going to jeopardize the operations. I think you are making an error. You are trying to save \$2 million but stand to lose many millions because you will not be able to investigate the cases. You will be giving money to people who should not get money. I think it is false economy.

Mr. LANHAM. Any time you try to cut the budget somebody says it is false economy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. With the number on old-age assistance declining, the cost of

administration has been mounting and mounting and mounting. It is about time we began to look at it and stop it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include two telegrams.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, with regard to grants to States for public assistance, social-security administration, I am very much afraid of the consequences of the limitation upon the amount to be available for State and local administration as set forth on page 5 of the pending bill.

In this connection, I received the following telegrams yesterday from Gov. Averell Harriman and Commissioner Raymond W. Houston, of New York State:

ALBANY, N. Y., February 4, 1957.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you will join in effort to strike from deficiency appropriation bill limitation on assistance for welfare administration which would cost New York State and local welfare departments \$400,000 and establish bad precedent of closed-end appropriations in this field. Telegram to you from Welfare Commissioner Raymond Houston contains details. Regards.

AVERELL HARRIMAN.

ALBANY, N. Y., February 4, 1957.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgency deficiency appropriation bill, 1957, chapter 3, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, grants to States for public assistance, contains a ceiling on expenditures for State and local administrative costs. Our State and local departments would lose about \$400,000 in Federal funds already anticipated in current budgets which have been reviewed and adopted by local appropriating bodies and fiscal authorities and the State legislature. Seek your opposition because of loss of revenue and because it changes present legal provisions for open-end appropriations.

RAYMOND W. HOUSTON,
Commissioner, New York State
Department of Social Welfare.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, you have heard Mr. ENGLE's discussion about the history of this legislation—Public Law 733, 84th Congress—and the reasons why Congress at its last session passed this legislation as being vital to the best interests of the United States. I should like to supplement those statements with some views of my own relative to the defense connotations of the strategic minerals industries.

It is true that ODM has said that based upon its present requirements' data it has accumulated a sufficient supply of some of these minerals. Every year ODM reviews its position as requirements' data change with new and different military demands and weapons. We all know that the kinds of weapons and material shift drastically in a very short

period of time. How much of a guided-missile program was there 5 years, 3 years, 2 years ago? As the weapons change so must the kinds and amounts of materials which must be available for their production change.

We are living today in a time of extremely rapid change in technology. It is impossible to sit here today and project how much of all minerals we are going to need for our minimum civilian needs and for our defense a few years from today. Four years ago we never heard about titanium. Yet, because of technological developments brought about by the Department of Defense and the aircraft industries to make faster aircraft to keep up with Russia we now have a several-hundred-million-dollar industry going in this very strategic metal. Five years ago we never thought about long-range continental rockets and the strategic minerals that would be necessary to make the high-temperature alloys to make such a development possible. Yet we all sit here, gentlemen, and hear testimony from the Department of Defense and from our own Appropriations Committee on the necessity for providing hundreds of millions of dollars in the direction of these new developments. I say to you that none of these are possible without the raw materials to make the alloys and to develop the fuels which can bring these new weapons of defense into existence. Our first line of defense is an adequate supply of everything we need on a continuing basis to keep our production lines as close to technological developments as possible.

Our military people have during the last few years deliberately designed out of weapons strategic and critical minerals like columbium, tantalum, tungsten, beryllium, cobalt, and others, not because these minerals and metals do not make superior weapons but because they do not have the materials available to mass-produce these superior weapons. As availability of dependable sources of supply of these materials increases this policy can and is being reversed.

Since the passage of Public Law 733 by the Congress last year the military have given instructions to their technological people to design more of these strategic minerals and metals, such as tungsten and nickel, into their defense weapons based upon the availability of these materials. This is a matter of necessity, not just whim. By way of illustration let me say that I am now reliably informed, as we all understand, that the Russians have made as great strides as we have in the development of jet engines. I am reliably informed that the Russians are using enormous quantities of these very strategic metals in their superior jet engines. Are we to say that we are satisfied with what we have by cutting off our ability to produce and use them even should we be able to design them?

About the projected uses for fluorspar let me say this: Since Public Law 733 was enacted last year the special assistant to the Secretary of Defense, in charge of guided missiles, stated to the American Chemical Society in New York that

one of the new rocket fuels being tested was liquid fluorine. This can be obtained only from fluorspar. All of the finest rockets in the world are of little use to us if we do not have the propellant for them. I ask, should we rely exclusively on foreign sources to provide us with the propellant for this defensive weapon? We are today living in an age of rapid technological developments. We cannot afford to overlook the fact that what might appear today to be a sufficiency in supply might tomorrow be wholly inadequate for all purposes.

In the first report of the atomic-energy program presented to the Congress it was stated that an adequate supply of fluorspar was as essential to the atomic-energy program as an adequate supply of uranium.

Yet, although the administration recommends it, our Appropriations Committee tells us that we no longer need to concern ourselves with domestic supplies of this material, although it takes but a short look at the facts to know that as atomic-power development takes place ever-increasing quantities of fluorspar are needed to make this hope a reality. I say to you today, gentlemen, that the domestic production in terms of tons of fluorspar in the United States now is less than it was 15 years ago. How can we ever hope to achieve the ultimate in technological developments for defense and industry if we deny ourselves the very tools to make them possible or put ourselves in the position of being totally dependent on these very materials from areas that are politically unstable in many cases or inaccessible under certain circumstances.

Let us consider for a moment the new technological developments which point to the necessity for enormously larger supply of tungsten. During the past few years there has been developed within the continental boundaries of the United States a tungsten mining industry which I am reliably informed by the Department of the Interior officials and others knowledgeable in this area is on the threshold of tremendous increases in utilization both for industry and defense. Yet we have a roomful in the stockpile. Are we to destroy this industry and destroy our ability to advance in technology in this area because we insist that this industry is no longer necessary to the welfare?

A little more than a year ago this small group of domestic tungsten producers sponsored a research program designed to develop the best heat-resistant alloy possible in the high-temperature field. This research project is supervised by the developer of the X-40 alloy which came into being in 1942 and is still used in the vanes and blades of the jet engine, and contains only 7½ percent of tungsten. As of a few weeks ago it was the best alloy available for those particular uses. But, thanks to this research program, a better alloy has been developed. However, it is still not adequate. During the last year there have been improvements as a result of this research that the Air Research and Development Command of the United States Air Force has requested the Tungsten Institute to

make available the results of its findings and to engage in a cooperative arrangement for an exchange of reports, program objectives, and requirements that will be mutually beneficial so that a tungsten-base alloy may be developed in the shortest possible period of time. In furtherance of this cooperative effort, the Wright Air Development Center has invited the Tungsten Institute to send a group of their engineers to Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, to cooperate in an effort to determine the structural properties and behavior of tungsten as a base metal. Such solicitation of cooperation directed to this small segment of the domestic mining industry is a testimonial of their splendid achievement and an admission of the great need for the development of superior materials for our jet engine parts, guided missiles, and nuclear and other high-temperature applications. These domestic tungsten miners deserve our highest praise for the pioneer work they have initiated and for the confidence manifested by the Air Force in the outcome of their joint effort in this important field of metallurgical research.

Are we to deny to these enterprising tungsten miners the small appropriation requested by the Budget Bureau and lose their production of this valuable resource? If so, they would be compelled to shut down, thus terminating their research program and depriving the Air Force of their valuable cooperation in an effort to improve the performance, durability, and safety as well as to extend the life of our military aircraft.

Consider for a moment, gentlemen, that without acid grade fluorspar no aluminum can be produced, and no hydrofluoric acid—the base for our chemical industry—could be produced. Fluoridation of water and the fluorine in our toothpaste, the best method known of preventing tooth decay, are wholly dependent upon acid grade fluorspar. Our atomic energy program, as I have said, is wholly dependent upon an adequate supply of acid grade fluorspar. Research in fluorine chemistry offers the greatest possibility for advancement of any of our chemical fields. Our Armed Forces today are testing lubricating oils which will last for the life of the engine, this being made possible by the use of one element derived solely from acid grade fluorspar. In this same field we have noninflammable paints and indestructible plasters made possible only through the use of acid grade fluorspar. Are we, gentlemen, wise in permitting these vital industries to become wholly dependent upon foreign sources for their supply of acid grade fluorspar? Who can say that tomorrow those foreign sources will not be in enemy hands and unavailable to us? Are we prepared to take that risk?

When the Stockpile Act was passed—Public Law 520—several years ago the Congress wisely provided that maximum effort should be expended in the direction of reducing our dependency, where possible, on foreign sources for strategic minerals and metals. We said to the executive agencies of the Government, "Go out and find new mineral deposits and bring them into production as a continuing and most dependable source of sup-

ply." This was done. In addition, we have put away large quantities in the warehouse. What we have in the warehouse is the difference between our present available supply during time of use and the total amount presently anticipated for use. If we cut off our dependable sources of domestic supply, then we have only what can be gleaned from foreign sources in an emergency or what we have stored up. Is this a risk we can afford to take—in the light of constant and continuing changes in requirements?

The President's Materials Policy Commission, known commonly as the Paley Commission, submitted in 1952 a projection to guide the materials policy of the United States in terms of their then best information on supply and requirements. Gentlemen, today those projections are as antiquated 5 years later in terms of strategic and critical materials as the military's estimate of rockets was 5 years ago. You could not today recognize either one of these projections in terms of our current needs, and who is to say that what we know today is all that is to be known, and all the development that is to take place in these areas?

When the United States Government decided a few years ago to spend some money developing the atom bomb we believed that this would probably be the ultimate in the utilization of uranium. We were told that there was little in the United States and that future uses of this mineral for power was in the long, long range. Because of an aggressive program in this direction we now talk about the development of power from uranium in the foreseeable future with all of its manifold benefits. Where would we be today if we had refused to spend any more money on uranium after we had developed and stored away 100 atom bombs?

Gentlemen, the philosophy of Public Law 520 is just as sound today as it was when it was written. We need to develop and keep alive our strategic minerals mines that have been built over the past few years at forced draft and tremendous energy. The Public Law 733 is nothing more than a method to carry out the purpose of the Stockpile Act and keep us as independent as possible in an area where dependence is courting disaster.

The testimony before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of both Houses last year made it unmistakably clear that if Public Law 733 were not made effective, these strategic minerals industries would be lost; some of the mines irretrievably. These are new industries that have not yet found their place in the competitive markets. If they are strangled in their infancy it will take many years to replace them. Public Law 733 was a program to keep them alive until they had sufficient virility to survive in open competition or until other programs promised this Congress could be devised to assist them.

We cannot afford to scrap these vital industries any more than we can afford to scrap our research programs in guided missiles and atomic energy.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to chapter 3 of the bill, having to do with public assistance. I think it is important to point out that this increase of 70 percent from 1950 to 1956, roughly from \$57,300,000 to \$97,600,000, was not just squandering money. It was spent for very definite reasons. I am indebted for these figures to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], who made inquiry of the Department concerning these facts. Twenty-six and six-tenths percent of the 70 percent came because of new programs added to the permanent disability program by the Congress. Fifty-seven and one-tenth percent, or \$23 million, came from salary increases which corresponded with increases given to other State employees.

Seven and four-tenths came from salaries for added personnel in order to take care of the program voted by the Congress. Eight and nine-tenths percent came from increased cost due to travel, which items were beyond the control of the States themselves.

I point out that I think the way this is worded it is subject to a point of order. I think it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and a point of order will be raised against it. But if we really want to cut down on the cost of administration, the proper place to do it is in the executive branch, because it is the executive branch that has to O. K. the various administrative costs which are assumed by the States. Therefore, obviously this is not the right time or place to take \$2 million out of this bill for administration of old-age assistance programs.

We are making every effort in the various States, particularly in California, and at this point I would like to put in the RECORD a telegram received from the Governor of the State of California.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., February 2, 1957.

JAMES ROOSEVELT,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Important you review chapter 3 urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1957 to delete language establishing ceilings on Federal reimbursement for public assistance administrative costs. States have responsibility under Federal Social Security Act for proper and efficient administration of aid programs. Limitation on Federal funds will hamper California program; also administrative moneys needed for 1956 amendments to act which place emphasis on self-support and self-care for aid recipients. Request you join others in California delegation to delete ceilings when bill reaches House floor Monday.

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,

Governor of California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to point out that in the various States every effort is being made to spend costs wisely, as I think is shown in the testimony of the committee at about page 88. It is an effort to make sure that people are rehabilitated and do not have to stay on these old-age assistance programs, in order that we may make a permanent saving. Far more than \$2 million is saved over and over again by these State programs. We should recognize that and recognize that this is certainly not only

inhuman as the testimony shows, but a very unfortunate way to try to improve the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, that concludes all the requests for time on this side.

Mr. TABER. I have no further requests.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural conservation program service

Emergency Conservation Measures

For an additional amount to enable the Secretary to make payments to farmers who carry out emergency measures to control wind erosion on farmlands or to rehabilitate farmlands damaged by wind erosion, floods, hurricanes, or other natural disasters when, as a result of the foregoing, new conservation problems have been created which, (1) if not treated, will impair or endanger the land, (2) materially affect the productive capacity of the land, (3) represent damage which is unusual in character and, except for wind erosion, is not the type which would recur frequently in the same area, and (4) will be so costly to rehabilitate that Federal assistance is or will be required to return the land to productive agricultural use, and for reimbursement to the appropriation to the President for "Disaster relief," for allocations to the Secretary of Agriculture for such purposes, \$15 million: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended without regard to the adjustments required under section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h), and may be distributed among States and individual farmers without regard to other provisions of law.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this legislation, as I represent a district which has suffered heavy damages on account of the prolonged drought.

I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that he funds provided for these emergency conservation measures are not made retroactive. This question was discussed by the subcommittee and the committee made some comments in the report as to whether or not payments under this program should be on a retroactive basis.

I personally feel that the program should be made retroactive so that we can protect those who have taken care of their land. I am disappointed that the committee did not include such a provision in this section. In some cases farmers have had to borrow the money to enable them to do this work. Naturally they would expect the Federal Government to reimburse them if a soil erosion program is adopted. I feel that the committee should have made these funds retroactive, and thereby protected those farmers who went ahead and did the necessary work to protect their land.

Along with my colleague from Kansas, [Mr. SMITH], and my colleague from Colorado [Mr. HILL], I signed a statement which was filed with the Appropriations Committee after the hearings

were closed. This statement reads as follows:

Inasmuch as we, the undersigned, desire to have our views made a part of the record or hearings on the item of \$25 million contained in House Document No. 48, 85th Congress, 1st session, on page 5 thereof under heading "Emergency Conservation Measures," we submit the following statement and ask that it be made a part of the hearings:

We, the undersigned, cannot stress too greatly the importance of making these cost-sharing payments to farmers for emergency wind erosion control work, retroactive to the 1st day of October 1956.

Soil blowing over a large area of the Great Plains had reached such proportions on or before October 1, 1956, that a great number of farmers were compelled to engage in emergency control measures in order to protect their land and that of their neighbors.

Those who engaged in such practices both before and since October 1, 1956, have spent large sums for this work. Others neglected their land and widespread damage both to their own land and that of their neighbors resulted.

It is our feeling that those who recognized the need for this work and performed it at the proper time should be permitted to participate in the distribution of these funds for such work performed after October 1, 1956, and the effective date of this grant as now proposed.

It would seem that this legislation should not prejudice the thrifty farmers who performed this service to the land when the need became apparent. To adequately control soil blowing, the work should be done before the soil actually commences to blow.

WINT SMITH,
Sixth District, Kansas.
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Third District, Colorado.
WILLIAM S. HILL,
Second District, Colorado.

This statement appears on page 148 of the hearings. We call attention to the fact that this money should be made retroactive; that we should not penalize those farmers who had the vision and foresight to protect their land, and in performing these emergency practices not only protected their own land from wind erosion but also protected the adjacent lands. I remind the committee that in previous years when we have had similar emergency wind erosion programs we have provided for retroactive payments. We think these funds should be made retroactive to October 1, 1956. This would be the fair and reasonable thing to do. In my opinion, we are doing this group a grave injustice by not making these payments retroactive to reimburse them for these emergency practices.

I am hoping that when this bill is considered in the other body a provision can be inserted in this section which will protect these farmers who have already performed the work for which these funds are being made available. I am not going to offer an amendment at this time, but I trust that the bill will contain such a provision before it is finally passed.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good program and this money is badly needed in the drought areas. I am anxious that Congress do everything possible to assist those who are in distress because of drought conditions. This is why I feel so strongly that we should extend this assistance to all of those who are deserving. Those who have had the initiative

to do this emergency work in recent months should not be penalized for doing so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter III. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: Page 5, line 3, insert the following:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Foreign Quarantine Service

"The provisions of law that govern the financing (including rates of pay for personnel) of overtime activities of the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, shall, effective 60 days after the enactment hereof, also govern the financing (including rates of pay for personnel) of overtime activities of the Foreign Quarantine Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: *Provided*, That in the case of difference between provisions of said law, the provisions governing the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall govern the Foreign Quarantine Service: *Provided further*, That whatever title of Government official or employee, name of an organization or unit, designation of an appropriation account, or similar nomenclature appears in any law, the most nearly comparable title, name, designation, or descriptive term in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be substituted for the purpose of this paragraph."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment just read by the Clerk has to do with an item for the Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Service, which was presented to the committee in the amount of \$67,500 to enable the Public Health Service to provide quarantine inspection of vessels on a 24-hour basis. At the present time, with a few special exceptions, inspections are made only during daylight hours. This has resulted in tying up shipping with losses estimated at between ten and twelve million dollars a year to the maritime business. The subcommittee as well as the full Committee on Appropriations saw fit to deny the requested \$67,500 in public money and has not included any appropriation therefor in the pending bill.

For many years past the steamship companies have been pleased to pay for the overtime services of customs and immigrant inspectors in inspecting their ships. None of these overtime costs have been borne by the Federal Treasury. For a number of years now, these companies have also sought permission to pay overtime pay on the same basis to the Foreign Quarantine Service so as to have 24-hour inspection service.

The adoption of the pending amendment would permit the companies to pay the overtime and would result in no cost whatever to the taxpayers. It would thus place the Foreign Quarantine Service inspection on the same basis as has

been the basis for overtime in Customs and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

In his testimony before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare on January 28, 1957, Dr. Calvin B. Spencer, Chief, Division of Foreign Quarantine, presented the following statement:

At present, inspections are made only during daylight hours at most ports, except for emergencies, resulting in forced layovers of vessels to await inspection. Because of the increased demand for shipping space in both tankers and dry-cargo vessels resulting from the Middle East situation, various measures have been undertaken to provide additional ships. Performing quarantine inspections on arrival should provide more effective utilization of existing vessels by decreasing time lost in port and make an immediate impact on the shipping shortage.

Dr. Spencer also had this to say:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the supplemental budget estimate under consideration involves a request for funds in the amount of \$67,500 for the fiscal year 1957. This sum is needed to pay for extended maritime inspectional services beyond the present regularly established 12-hour day.

The situation in the Middle East, with the resulting pressures on shipping to move cargoes of food, oil and other supplies into the European countries, has made it essential that turnaround time for ships be kept to a minimum in order that they can reload and be on their way. This shipping emergency has reemphasized the past requests of the shippers that hours of boarding service be extended, because of the economic losses to the industry through forced layovers while awaiting quarantine inspection. These losses greatly exceed the cost to the Government of providing this service and it has been stated that they amount to 10 to 12 millions of dollars per year. In some instances the loss on a single vessel will approximate \$5,000 for 1 night's delay.

Rather than to staff for full 24-hour coverage, it is proposed to use the present staff, on an overtime basis, to do the inspections as they are requested for each individual vessel.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that adoption of the pending amendment, which I am sure is acceptable to all members of the committee, will solve the distressing situation presented by Dr. Spencer by providing 20-hour quarantine inspection service of vessels without any cost whatever to the taxpayer.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. It will not cost the Government anything, but, in fact, will save the Government many times more than the \$67,500 involved.

The Bureau of the Budget requested \$67,500 for the remainder of this fiscal year to institute 24-hour quarantine service for all ships entering United States ports. Heretofore, quarantine service has been available only during daytime hours, and if a vessel entered port in the evening after quarantine offices were closed, it was compelled to wait until the following day before discharging cargo. It is estimated that this loss of time costs American and foreign shipping companies about \$10 million per year.

The current shortage of ships has emphasized the need for additional shipping space. Ships are being "broken out" of the United States Reserve Fleet. A faster "turnaround" time for ships already in operation could help relieve the shortage. The "turnaround" time could be shortened by extending the hours of quarantine service by the Public Health Service agencies.

While the shortage of shipping space presents the emergency factor—which factor will exist throughout 1957—there are other factors which should be of interest to the Committee on Appropriations.

First. Most of the United States shipping lines which are subsidized are in a "recapture" bracket. That is, their earnings are presently in excess of 10 percent of their capital necessarily employed. Fifty percent of their profits in excess of 10 percent are paid to the United States Government. As an example then, if the cost to the subsidized lines through loss of time occasioned by lack of 24-hour quarantine service should amount to \$1 million annually—a conservative figure—then the cost to the Government would approach the \$500,000 figure.

Second. Even were the lines not in the "recapture" position the Government would still be out of pocket. Most of the Government's operating subsidy payments consist of wage differentials, i. e., the difference in wages paid to American seamen and foreign seamen. These run as high as 75 percent. Therefore, the loss of time to American shipping lines through lack of quarantine service results in higher operating subsidy payments. These would exceed the \$67,500 requested by the budget.

Third. The Military Sea Transport Service, a United States Government agency, operates over 250 ships. About 100 of these are subject to quarantine inspection the same as commercial vessels. Any loss of time to them resulting in increased costs is a cost borne by the Government. This cost could greatly exceed the \$67,500 requested by the budget.

For the above reasons a deletion of the \$67,500 figure from the appropriations bill would result in a loss to the Government which could reach several times that amount.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Grants to States for public assistance

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance," \$275,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$99,000,000 of the funds available under this head for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, shall be expended for State and local administration.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that part of the chapter following the colon in line 7 and reading: "*Provided*, That not to exceed \$99,000,000 of the funds available under this head for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, shall be expended for State and local administration," on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the language and feels that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Page 5, line 7, after "\$275,000,000," strike out the colon and insert: "*Provided*, That not more than \$15,728,000 of this amount may be used for State and local administration."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the same ground; that is, it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, of course, this is a limitation on an appropriation and it is in no sense legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] and is of the opinion that the language constitutes a proper limitation on the appropriation contained in the paragraph; therefore, the language is in order and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. Does not the amendment that the gentleman has offered cut the limitation on funds available to the States back to the \$99 million instead of the \$101 million which they feel is necessary to match the funds they have appropriated for this purpose?

Mr. LANHAM. The estimated administrative expenses for the year are \$101 million. On a pro rata basis there is \$83,272,000 in the total appropriation of \$1,300,000,000 already made and there is \$17,728,000 in the supplemental request of \$277 million. This cuts the \$17,728,000 back to \$15,728,000 and has nothing to do with the funds that have already been appropriated.

Mr. RILEY. It limits the States for the fiscal year 1957 to matching funds of \$99 million instead of the \$101 million which they state is required to match the money which the States are spending for this purpose?

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, it would reduce the total.

Mr. RILEY. To \$99 million?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. RILEY. Just as the bill provides here?

Mr. LANHAM. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, as I tried to explain a little while ago, this committee has simply tried to save money where money could be saved and to stop the rising cost of the administration of this program. In one of my letters recently sent to my constituents I used a little couplet which I think sums up what we are headed for unless somebody does attempt to put the brakes on to reduce these appropriations. I said something like the following:

Hush little budget, don't you cry.
You'll be a trillion bye and bye.

That is exactly what is going to happen unless we put the brakes on somewhere. This committee is trying to do that here.

The gentleman from California, and I have great respect for him, said something about this being a heartless way to try to cut the budget. He referred to disability training. This has nothing to do with that. This simply puts the people back home on notice that we cannot go on permitting the cost of administration of this program to rise. It does not affect the recipients at all. We always cut the amount that they ask for here in Washington for administration purposes. The folks back home have to learn that they must administer this program as efficiently as possible.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Can the committee advise us with reference to the increase in the cost of administration as to whether it has occurred at the State, the county, or at the Federal level?

Mr. LANHAM. The figures I gave a while ago were the total for State and local.

Mr. COOLEY. I understand the committee has indicated that the cost of administration has increased 75 percent since 1950 while the caseload has increased only 3 percent.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I am, of course, disturbed about that.

Mr. LANHAM. We all ought to be.

Mr. COOLEY. In my own county I am advised that the cost of administration has not increased, that, on the contrary, the caseload has increased. Because my people have been thrifty in administrative costs it seems to me they are going to be penalized and it seems to me also that this is an unwise and an unfair way to administer the program. I have telegrams from the Governor of my State and also from the State commissioner of welfare and one from the welfare officer of my own home county and they are all very much disturbed about the reduction.

Mr. LANHAM. They are disturbed all over the country. You will get letters about this and I think everybody has. We are going to hear about every effort we make to cut appropriations.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the committee try to determine where this cost has increased?

Mr. LANHAM. We did not go into the details as to whether it had increased here or someplace else.

Mr. COOLEY. It may be loaded down with a bunch of bureaucrats here in Washington.

Mr. LANHAM. We almost always cut the requests they make.

Mr. COOLEY. They may still be well paid at the Washington level while the caseloads at the State level have increased and the staff at county and State level is underpaid.

Mr. LANHAM. That is not probable.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that I am a member of this committee and that we have not cut this appropriation for administration for welfare. As a matter of fact, we have increased it about \$15 million. One Member after another has spoken here and said that we should cut this budget; that we should cut this appropriation. Now, this Department requested \$277 million; \$260 million of that was to pay the recipients of welfare. The remainder was for administration. The only place we could cut was in administration. Now, that fund has gone up over 75 percent for administration since 1950. The workload has only gone up 3 percent. Now, if it is going to be cut, that is the only place we can cut it. If this amendment is not adopted, we are going to take \$2 million away from the recipients and you give that same \$2 million to these people who go out and investigate these claims. Now, this committee was trying to carry out the will of this Congress that we hear over and over again that we should make cuts. Of course, we cannot make appropriations to any one county, as somebody suggested. The only thing we can do is make an overall cut. It is a small amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RILEY to the amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Strike out "\$15,728,000" and insert "\$17,728,000."

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, this does not raise the appropriation which this fine committee has brought to the House. It simply increases the limitation from \$99 million to \$101 million to match the funds which the States are providing for the administration of this program. Under the social security law, as we all know, the Federal Government is pledged to match these administration funds with the States. Now, the States have submitted their estimates for this last quarter to administer this program, and in my opinion we would not be fulfilling our contract unless we gave them the \$101 million which they say they need to carry out the program.

If there is any waste in this program, I am satisfied it is not in the States. Their accounts and procedures are very closely scrutinized, and I think the fact that they match the Federal appropriation dollar for dollar means that they are going to be very careful, because they are spending their own money just as they are spending the money which is

appropriated by the Federal Government. So, I hope that the committee will at least put this fund back to the \$101 million which the States say they need to carry out this program for the old, aged people, the blind, the orphans, the disabled, and people of that nature.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. And the same thing can be said about the several counties of the country. They have fixed their 1957 budgets in contemplation of this amount of money being made available.

Mr. RILEY. The point of the gentleman is well taken. This cutting down of this fund comes in the midst of the fiscal year, and the counties and the States will have no means to raise the difference in the money it will take to carry out this program, and the Federal Government will not be meeting its obligation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the Riley amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. McDONOUGH: On page 5, line 7, strike out all after the semicolon on line 7 to the period on line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a substitute amendment, because that language has been stricken out on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Oregon and sustained by the Chair. That language is not in the bill at the moment.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I withdraw the amendment and rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, like many of the other States that have heavy social security administration loads, California is in the same category. I have here a wire from the Governor of the State; from the Supervisors Association of the State of California and from many other sources we have heard that any limitation on the administration of these funds is going to work a hardship on the caseload and the administration of social security. I propose an amendment here to remove any limitation. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] is recommending a limitation which is equal to the practice that we have had in the past.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. I offered an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] providing for a limitation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

Mr. RILEY. My amendment to his amendment simply provides the amount of money which the States themselves say that they will need to carry on the program.

Mr. McDONOUGH. However, the gentleman's amendment is a limitation. The basic Social Security Act provides matching funds, 50-50, between the

States and the Federal Government. The situation so far as the gentleman's amendment is concerned is that it is a limitation similar to the one offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] except it adds \$2 million. But it still is a limitation of only \$101 million.

I am not asking for any reduction in the proposal made by the committee, nor am I asking for any increase in the amount the committee recommends. The estimate, as I read the report, is \$277 million for this purpose. The committee reports to the House \$275 million. That is perfectly all right. But when you come to administer the funds in a State which has a heavy caseload and where the problem is to find by investigation what people who are entitled to social security should be on the rolls and whether any who are asking should not be on the rolls and you do not permit administrative funds to do that job, it is not fair. This will mean that the State of California will get \$400,000 less money for administrative purposes.

I definitely think that we should not put a limitation in here, even the one submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina, nor the one offered by the gentleman from Georgia. I think we should allow them to operate under the formula in the basic law, and if we are going to change that it should be done at some other time and not in an appropriation bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I suggest to my colleague that this would be the proper way to do it—to defeat the amendment to the amendment and then to defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia, leaving the language of the bill providing a total amount of \$275 million which would not raise the budget but which would, however, eliminate the objections which the gentleman is now offering?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is exactly what I am saying.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Therefore, we should vote down both amendments.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

The House Committee on Appropriations in reporting out the Urgent Deficiency Appropriations Act, 1957, recommended, first, to reduce the amount of the appropriation request for grants to States for public assistance from \$277 million to \$275 million, and, second, to insert language in the bill that would limit the Federal funds available for administrative expenses incurred by the States for fiscal year 1957 to \$99 million as compared with estimated requirements of \$101 million. The adoption of the limitation under consideration would have serious implications for the programs of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

The committee report, in commenting on this item, indicates that the basic legislation establishes mathematical formula for granting these funds to the States and that the costs of the program are beyond administrative control except

for the relatively small amount for the administration of the program. As I understand it, the formula which provides for Federal matching of administrative costs on a 50-50 basis is no less an obligation under the basic statute than is the Federal responsibility for matching assistance payments; consequently, the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations abrogates without prior notice and appropriate hearings, an arrangement which has been in effect since 1946 whereby the Federal Government meets by law one-half of State expenditures for administration.

Special problems are presented by the proposed application of such a limitation provision in relation to a supplemental appropriation. The States have made their fiscal plans for these Federal-State programs based upon the expectation of receiving 50 percent of the costs of administration for the year. The limitation would cause a great deal of hardship on States in that the total reduction of \$2 million would have to be applied against the fourth quarter Federal grants to States. The effect would be an 8-percent reduction in that quarter. This would mean, for example, that the State of California would receive about \$400,000 less in Federal funds than they would be entitled to under the 50-50 matching formula in the Social Security Act. The reduction in Federal funds would mean that many States would have to furlough some of their State and local personnel. Such actions would result in inadequate investigation of applicants for assistance and delay action on applications for assistance from the aged, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children.

I do not believe that an appropriation bill is the appropriate vehicle for amending the fiscal provisions of a program which involves more than 5 million people and the Federal expenditure of over \$1.5 billion a year.

The wire from Governor Knight, of California, which I referred to is as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., February 2, 1957.
GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Important you review chapter 3 urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1957 to delete language establishing ceilings on Federal reimbursement for public assistance administrative costs States have responsibility under Federal Social Security Act for proper and efficient administration of aid programs limitation on Federal funds will hamper California program also administrative monies needed for 1956 amendments to act which place emphasis on self support and self care for aid recipients request you join others in California delegation to delete ceilings when bill reaches House floor Monday.

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Governor of California.

The wire from the California Superiors Association is as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., February 2, 1957.
Congressman GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Chapter 3 of urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1957 providing funds for public

assistance grants and administration is of grave concern to California counties because it sets ceiling on such Federal appropriations for the first time. California counties must expect the Federal Government to appropriate, without ceilings, necessary funds for full one-half of administrative costs. Urge you join other California Congressmen in seeking amendments to delete ceilings in chapter 3. Understand bill set for floor action Monday or Tuesday.

BILL MACDOUGALL,
General Manager, County Supervisors Association of California.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RILEY. Would my amendment to the amendment be considered before the amendment is considered?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment to the amendment would be voted on first.

Mr. RILEY. Then the vote on the amendment would follow after the House had worked its will on my amendment, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RILEY. I thank the Chair.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in opposing this amendment I do not argue over the \$99 million or the \$101 million. It seems to me if we adopt this proposal we would basically change the nature and scope of this very important program from what is set forth in the Social Security Act.

Titles I, IV, and X of that act have been in operation since 1935. Title XIV, relating to the permanently and totally disabled, has been in operation since 1950. The pattern of operation has been proven over the years. This proposed amendment is an attempt to bypass the regularly constituted legislative processes of this body and to change basic legislation by appropriation language without adequate consideration of these changes by the proper committees of the Congress after full hearings.

This is not a question of whether \$101 million or \$99 million will be appropriated for the remainder of the current fiscal year. Much more than that is at stake.

Under these titles of the Social Security Act, open-end appropriation programs are established. The concept is quite simple. Because the number of potential recipients could not be determined accurately in advance, the Congress did not state in the act the maximum amount of Federal funds which would be available to match State expenditures. Instead, the Congress made a promise to the States that it would match certain percentages of State expenditures both for welfare payments to recipients and for the costs of administering the programs. The only limitations were the maxima on payments to individual recipients and that matching would be available only for such administrative expenditures as are found by the Secretary to be necessary.

The pattern adopted by the Congress for this program was a deliberate pattern. It was designed to preserve and

protect to the maximum extent possible State control over these programs.

With respect to Federal matching for administrative expenses, which is the point involved in this particular proposal, the basic statutes provide that the Secretary shall pay to each State "an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan."

The act does not state that the determination by the Secretary of the amounts necessary to administer any one State plan is to be limited by the amounts appropriated by the Congress. An expenditure by a State agency does not become less necessary or even unnecessary dependent on whether Federal funds are or are not appropriated.

The proposed change would be particularly disruptive of the orderly administration of these programs. If this proviso were enacted, no State agency administering these public-assistance programs would be able to plan intelligently and according to sound fiscal practices. No longer would the criteria used in determining whether Federal funds would be available be whether or not the State expenditures were necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the programs. The amount of Federal funds made available to each State would depend not on its own expenditures but on the expenditures of all the other States. The proviso makes no provision for pro rata distribution of the amounts available. Are they to be distributed on the basis of the ratio of each State's population to the total population of all the States? But that would not be fair and equitable in the old-age assistance program, for example. Should those be distributed on the basis of the aged population?

The basic act provides also for adjustments in the State's accounts from time to time as it is determined that more or less than what was due to State had been paid to it. Such adjustments come about most frequently after Federal audit of the State's accounts, which can take place during subsequent fiscal years. If then a State is to be denied reimbursement in a later fiscal year for proper expenditures previously made only because Federal funds appropriated had all been paid out, then we would be opening up the greatest grab bag this Nation has ever seen. The premium would be upon overestimating needed Federal funds, rather than in estimating State expenditures accurately. Such procedures would do more than disrupt State fiscal planning—they would also disrupt the orderly budget practices of the Federal Government.

If this proposal is enacted we would be creating a hydra-headed monster. We would be changing basically the method of operation of these programs without adequate direction to the Secretary as to how these changes are to be administered. We cannot legislate by delegation to uncontrolled and undirected administrative discretion.

We cannot disrupt the orderly processes of the administration of programs which have been functioning under

clearly defined limits for over 20 years by hasty, ill-conceived proposals tacked onto appropriation acts.

The welfare of our aged, our blind, our dependent children, and our handicapped should be of more concern to us than to permit the passage of crippling legislation. If those who propose such amendments sincerely desire to bring them about, then I would suggest that the regular procedures of the Congress be employed—that bills for these purposes be introduced and referred to the proper committees, there to be considered after full public hearings and then reported to both bodies for deliberate and considered action.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this, Mr. Chairman, so that we may obtain the program for tomorrow and the rest of the week, and for next week, if that is possible. May I also request the majority leader, if he can at this time, to inform the House of the agreement the two leaderships have reached with respect to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very happy to do so. After the disposition of this bill, the next order of business will be the resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules. Then, there is a bill that has been reported by the Committee on Armed Services. If, as I assume, they will be disposed of today, and, if not, they will continue until tomorrow, tomorrow there will be the drought bill up. A rule has been reported out of the Committee on Rules. I am informed by the chairman of the committee, and I concur, that there will be a rollcall on the passage of that bill. With the passage of that bill, I am hopeful that all legislative business for this week will have been completed tomorrow. I am not in a position to announce any program for next week, but I will do so on Thursday. But, in the event of any program for next week for Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday, and if there should be any rollcalls to be taken, it is the understanding of the leadership on both sides, in view of the fact that the anniversary of Lincoln's birthday will be celebrated on Tuesday, and because many of our Republican colleagues have speaking engagements in connection with Lincoln's birthday, any rollcalls will not take place before Thursday of next week.

Mr. MARTIN. May I say to the gentleman that it would be agreeable to me, and I am sure to all on this side, if it is desired to meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock in order to assure the completion of the program I will not object.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is very fine, but I think we will be better able to decide that when we see what transpires during the remainder of the day.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment. The amount of money at the moment, the \$2 million which would be cut by the adoption of the recommendation of the committee is not nearly so important as the principle involved in this matter, which is a departure from

an agreement of 21 years' duration, an agreement with the States and the counties to underwrite one-half of the administrative costs of these aid programs. At a time when the county governments are diligently seeking means to reduce costs and to control the strong pressures for increases, when the State legislatures are grappling with the problems just as we are here, we propose to say that we are going to put a ceiling on our part of this package. We are going to say, "We have spent years encouraging you to expand your staff and to undertake a better supervision of these programs; we impose upon you standards as to the type of personnel that you will employ in your local welfare departments—we have you effectively over the barrel." And now we are going to say, "We are going to back away and this is all of the kitty that we are going to ante up." Mr. Chairman, that is not responsible government. It is not the proper means for cutting the cost. If we want to reduce costs in administering these programs, let us then examine into the regulations which have been adopted under the laws passed by this Congress which impose upon local governments requirements as to the standards of staff, as to the qualifications of the personnel working in these departments.

There is where we will effect savings, if savings can be effected. But, let us maintain the integrity of this House and recognize that agreement which has existed for years. Regardless of how strong the desire is in each of us to see some reduction in the cost of Government, a great part of the cost of increased administrative overhead has arisen because the Congress has broadened the categories of aid. They have done that in recent years. There has been in State government and county government just as there has been in the Federal Government, increased costs of salaries of personnel. I believe that approximately 7 percent covers the cost of new personnel to the program. Three percent of that represents the increased caseload. Some of it I sincerely hope represents sounder supervision of these programs because it does not save money if you reduce the cost of supervision and thereby permit widespread abuses to develop where people who are not properly qualified receive aid under the various laws enacted by the Congress and shared in by the States and local governments. This is not the proper place to effect sound and lasting economies. All we are doing here is waltz on an agreement and back away from a commitment which has been honored for some 21 years. We can do the job properly by voting down both amendments, and by permitting the proper legislative committee to examine into the entire program. But at the moment, let us keep away from the amendments, and meet our obligations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], and in favor of the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to look at this thing according to the history of it. This is the history: Last spring when the bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was before the Congress, it provided for a certain proportion and a certain item for expenditure for administration. The Congress subsequently passed an amendment to the statute which governed the amount that the different States might use. They increased the amount. They did not increase the number of people involved. So, here we have a picture of administration which was satisfactory to the States when that bill was passed last spring, and we have a proposal to increase the administrative expenses that quick. I was much disturbed when I began to see this situation and when I began to see that they were spending 8 percent of the total for administrative expenses. If the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] is agreed to, \$2 million of that increase that is proposed to be added in this bill would be cut out, but the rest of it would be there.

I do not know how greedy these people can get, but it does seem to me that we ought to be a little particular about how we handle these things, and that we ought to approach the thing from an honest basis and that we ought to expect the States to be honest with us. It is not a question of welfare with me. It is a question of being honest with the people of the United States, and the different States that we between us represent in this Congress. I do not see how we can fail to meet our responsibility and vote "No" on the substitute and vote "Aye" on the amendment which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] has offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. RILEY) there were—ayes 17, noes 90.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROOSEVELT) there were—ayes 89, noes 42.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the telegram which I have received from Mrs. Mary Evelyn Parker, commissioner of public welfare, State of Louisiana, regarding the urgent deficiency appropriation bill before us for consideration today.

BATON ROUGE, LA., February 4, 1957.
HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We oppose action of House Appropriations Committee placing ceiling on administration costs in public assistance in urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1957, which would reduce Federal participation in State costs. This seems inconsistent with 1956 social-security amendments placing greater emphasis on services to reduce dependency. Our program is expanding to carry out intent of 1956 amendments. We believe Congress should make it possible for the Federal agency to finance its share of expenditures. We will appreciate your working to this end.

MARY EVELYN PARKER,
Commissioner of Public Welfare.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4249) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment to chapter III adopted in the Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not the Chair will put them en masse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Page 5, line 7, after "\$275,000,000", strike out the colon and insert "Provided, That not more than \$15,728,000 of this amount may be used for State and local administration."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" had it.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order and ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon) there were—ayes 118, noes 46.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground

that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The point of order is that that request has already been made in reference to this vote, and the gentleman withdrew it.

The SPEAKER. The objection to the voice vote on the grounds that a quorum was not present was withdrawn. The objection to the vote by division, on the grounds that a quorum is not present, is in order.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 167, answered "present" 1, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—206

Abbott	Fenton	Miller, Nebr.
Abernethy	Fisher	Miller, N. Y.
Adair	Fogarty	Mills
Alexander	Ford	Minshall
Alger	Forrester	Mumma
Allen, Calif.	Fountain	Murray
Andersen	Frelinghuysen	Nicholson
H. Carl	Gary	Nimtz
Andrews	Gathings	Norrell
Auchincloss	Gavin	O'Hara, Minn.
Avery	George	Osmer
Ayres	Gregory	Ostertag
Baker	Griffin	Passman
Barden	Gross	Pelly
Bass, N. H.	Gubser	Pillion
Bates	Hale	Poff
Baumhart	Harden	Preston
Beamer	Hardy	Prouty
Becker	Harris	Ray
Beckworth	Harrison, Nebr.	Rees, Kans.
Bentley	Harrison, Va.	Robeson, Va.
Berry	Harvey	Robison, Ky.
Betts	Haskell	Rogers, Mass.
Bolton	Henderson	St. George
Bonner	Heselton	Schenck
Bosch	Hess	Scherer
Bow	Hiestand	Schwengel
Bray	Hill	Scott, N. C.
Broomfield	Hoeven	Scott, Pa.
Brown, Ga.	Hoffman	Scrivner
Brown, Mo.	Holt	Scudder
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Sheehan
Broyhill	Hull	Shuford
Budge	Jackson	Siler
Bush	James	Simpson, Pa.
Byrne, Ill.	Jenkins	Smith, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Cannon	Johansen	Smith, Va.
Carrigg	Johnson	Springer
Cederberg	Jonas	Stauffer
Chamberlain	Judd	Steed
Chenoweth	Kean	Taber
Chipperfield	Kearns	Talle
Church	Keating	Taylor
Clevenger	Keeney	Teague, Calif.
Cole	Kilburn	Teague, Tex.
Collier	Kitchin	Tewes
Colmer	Knox	Thomas
Corbett	Laird	Thompson, Tex.
Coudert	Landrum	Thomson, Wyo.
Cretella	Lanham	Tollefson
Cunningham,	Latham	Tuck
Iowa	LeCompte	Utt
Cunningham,	Lipscomb	Van Pelt
Nebr.	McConnell	Van Zandt
Curtin	McCulloch	Vinson
Curtis, Mass.	McGregor	Vorys
Curtis, Mo.	McIntire	Vursell
Dague	McIntosh	Walter
Davis, Ga.	McMillan	Weaver
Dawson, Utah	McVey	Westland
Dennison	Mack, Wash.	Wharton
Denton	Mahon	Whitener
Deronian	Maillard	Widnall
Devereux	Marshall	Wigglesworth
Dixon	Martin	Williams, Miss.
Dooley	Mason	Wilson, Calif.
Durham	May	Winstead
Dwyer	Michel	Younger
Evins	Miller, Md.	

NAYS—167

Addonizio	Garmatz	O'Brien, N. Y.
Albert	Gordon	O'Hara, Ill.
Anderson,	Granahan	O'Konski
Mont.	Grant	O'Neill
Anfuso	Gray	Patman
Ashley	Green, Ore.	Patterson
Ashmore	Griffiths	Post
Aspinall	Hagen	Poage
Baldwin	Hébert	Polk
Baring	Hemphill	Porter
Barrett	Herlong	Powell
Bass, Tenn.	Hillings	Price
Bennett, Fla.	Hollifield	Rabaut
Bennett, Mich.	Holland	Rains
Blatnik	Holmes	Reuss
Blitch	Holtzman	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boggs	Hosmer	Rhodes, Pa.
Boland	Huddleston	Riley
Bolling	Ikard	Rivers
Boyle	Jennings	Roberts
Breeding	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Brooks, La.	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Brooks, Tex.	Karsten	Rogers, Fla.
Burleson	Kee	Rogers, Tex.
Byrd	Kilday	Rooney
Byrne, Pa.	Kilgore	Roosevelt
Canfield	King	Rutherford
Carnahan	Kirwan	Sadiak
Celler	Kluczynski	Santangelo
Chelf	Knutson	Saund
Christopher	Lane	Seely-Brown
Chudoff	Lankford	Selden
Clark	Lennon	Shelley
Coad	Loser	Sheppard
Coffin	McCarthy	Sieminski
Cooley	McCormack	Sikes
Cooper	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Davis, Tenn.	McFall	Sisk
Dawson, Ill.	Macdonald	Smith, Miss.
Delaney	Machrowicz	Spence
Diggs	Mack, Ill.	Staggers
Dollinger	Madden	Sullivan
Dorn, S. C.	Magnuson	Thompson, La.
Dowdy	Matthews	Thompson, N. J.
Eberhart	Marrow	Trimble
Edmondson	Metcalf	Udall
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Ullman
Engle	Moore	Wainwright
Fallon	Morgan	Watts
Fascell	Morris	Wier
Feighan	Moss	Willis
Pino	Multer	Withrow
Flood	Natcher	Wright
Forand	Neal	Yates
Frazier	Norblad	Young
Friedel	O'Brien, Ill.	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Saylor

NOT VOTING—58

Allen, Ill.	Flynt	Morano
Andresen,	Fulton	Morrison
August H.	Green, Pa.	Moulder
Arends	Gwinn	Perkins
Bailey	Haley	Philbin
Belcher	Halleck	Pilcher
Bowler	Hays, Ark.	Radwan
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Reece, Tenn.
Brownson	Healey	Reed
Buckley	Hyde	Riehlman
Burdick	Jarman	Smith, Wis.
Cramer	Kearney	Teller
Dellay	Kelley, Pa.	Thornberry
Dempsey	Kelly, N. Y.	Vanik
Dies	Keogh	Whitten
Dingell	Krueger	Williams, N. Y.
Donohue	Lesinski	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn, N. Y.	Long	Wolverton
Doyle	McGovern	Zelenko
Farbsteln	Meador	

So the amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dies with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Long with Mr. Dellay.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cramer.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Meador.
Mr. Teller with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Farbsteln with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Vanik with Mr. Fulton.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Dorn of New York.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Brownson.
 Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. August H. Andresen.
 Mr. Haley with Mr. Hyde.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Kearney.
 Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Williams of New York.
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
 Mr. Healey with Mr. Krueger.
 Mr. Doyle with Mr. Gwinn.
 Mr. Bowler with Mr. Reed of New York.
 Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. If he were present he would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING HOUSE SESSION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary for the rest of the week may be privileged to sit on various bills while the House is in session engaged in general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may sit while the House is in session today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

INSPECTION OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 64 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommit-

tee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following programs of benefits for veterans and their dependents and survivors:

(1) The programs of compensation and pension;

(2) The programs of hospitalization, domiciliary care, medical and dental care and treatment, and furnishing of prosthetic appliances;

(3) The insurance and indemnity programs;

(4) The housing and business loan programs, and the program of furnishing assistance for the acquisition of specially adapted housing;

(5) The programs of education and training (including vocational rehabilitation);

(6) The furnishing of burial allowances; and

(7) The furnishing of unemployment compensation under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; with a view to determining whether or not such programs are being conducted economically, efficiently, in the best interests of the Government and the beneficiaries of such programs, and in such a manner as to avoid the misuse of Government funds; whether or not such programs adequately serve the needs and protect the welfare of the beneficiaries of such programs; and whether changes in the law or in the administration and operation of the programs either will lead to greater efficiency and economy or will make such programs more adequately serve the needs of the beneficiaries of such programs. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, after "That," insert: "effective from January 4, 1957."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed."

Page 3, line 7, after the word "House" strike out the words "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I offer an additional committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 2, line 19, after the word "programs", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 20 and 21.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the customary resolution authorizing the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct investigations concerning matters within the jurisdiction of that

committee. I have no request for time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is one of a number of authorizing resolutions for committees to conduct investigations and is in the usual form. I am hoping that we may be able to consider them all today. I have no request for time on this particular resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 104 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct through studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, within or without the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions, as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpoena or otherwise, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

Sec. 3. The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any studies or investigations made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, following the word "That" insert the following: ", effective from January 4, 1957."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed."

Page 1, line 4, change "through" to read "thorough."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, change the period to a colon, and insert the following: "Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House."

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I with-

draw the amendment just read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 12, strike out "or without."
Page 2, line 2, strike out "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 99 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1957, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations and studies into matters within its jurisdiction, including the following:

(1) Policies with respect to competition among the various modes of transportation, whether rail, air, motor, water, or pipeline; measures for increased safety; and adequacy of the national transportation system for defense and the needs of an expanding economy;

(2) Policies with respect to the promotion of the development of civil aviation; measures for increased safety; restrictions on American air carriers which impede the free flow of commerce; rates, accounts, and continuance of subsidy payments; airport construction, hazards of adjacency to airports, and condemnation of airspace; aircraft and airline liability; aircraft research and development, and market for American aircraft; and air navigational aids and traffic control;

(3) Availability of channels for allocation for radio and television; and divestment of international radio and cable facilities;

(4) Adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure and regulatory provisions of the various Securities Acts;

(5) Adequacy of petroleum, natural gas, and electric energy resources for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; adequacy, promotion, regulation, and safety of the facilities for extraction or generation, transmission and distribution of such resources; development of synthetic liquid fuel processes; and regulation of security issues of and control of natural gas pipeline companies;

(6) Advertising, fair competition, and labeling;

(7) Research in weather, including air pollution and smog, and artificially induced weather; research into the basic sciences; and standards and weights and measures;

(8) Effects of inflation upon benefits provided under railroad retirement and railroad unemployment programs; and inequities in provisions of statutes relating thereto, with comparison of benefits under the social security;

(9) Adequacy of medical facilities, medical personnel, and medical teaching and training facilities; research into human diseases; provisions for medical care; efficient and effective quarantine; protection to users against incorrectly labeled and deleterious foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices; and other matters relating to public health;

(10) Disposition of funds arising from the operation of the Trading With the Enemy Act;

(11) Current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such

other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges; current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternative source materials;

(12) Increase in traffic accidents on the streets and highways of the United States during recent years; factors responsible for such increase; the resulting deaths, personal injuries, and economic losses; and measures for eliminating such accidents or reducing their frequency and severity; and

(13) The administration and enforcement by departments and agencies of the Government of provisions of law relating to subjects which are within the jurisdiction of such committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "3" and insert "4."
Page 4, line 11, strike out "or outside" and "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLLING: Page 4, line 5, after the word "committee", strike out the remainder of line 5 and lines 6 and 7 and insert a period.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Why is that language being stricken out of the resolution here and in the case of House Resolution 104 the amendment was withdrawn?

Mr. BOLLING. The language is being stricken out because it was determined in consultation with the chairmen of the various committees that rather than serving the purpose for which it was intended it would increase competition between committees and cause confusion. The action taken today in the various resolutions is designed to eliminate uniformly that particular language from all the investigative resolutions.

Mr. GROSS. The committee has determined that it is in the best interest not to have that language in any of these resolutions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman from Ohio called the fact to the attention of the committee that this wording would actually permit other committees to raid the standing legislative committees simply by announcing an investigation was going to be made, barring the regular committee named for that particular purpose and having jurisdiction over certain legislation from investigating the very field for which they were created. So the amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], and pending that I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would not take the time of the House were it not for the fact that what I am about to say I know is of much interest to many Members of this House. Of course, I am in wholehearted support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, many Members have asked me and other members of our committee about the tragic air accidents which occurred in the last few days.

AVIATION STUDY AND ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION

In support of this resolution, I wish to announce that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Wednesday morning will begin an investigation of the recent aircraft tragedies which have shocked the Nation.

Although our attention will be focused on the collision of a DC-7 and AF-89 jet fighter Thursday over a suburb of Los Angeles and the crash of an airliner in a snowstorm in New York Friday evening, the investigation actually will be a continuation of a study of airspace use and navigation aids undertaken by the committee during the last Congress, as well as the overall subject of aviation under our committee jurisdiction.

On Wednesday morning, representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration will give the committee preliminary reports on their investigations of the two accidents mentioned. We will want to know what steps have and can be taken to prevent a recurrence of such tragedies.

Later, the committee will hear other Government officials, including representatives of the Air Force, company officials and employees, and CAA traffic-control personnel. In addition to getting the facts regarding the recent tragedies, a multitude of problems must be studied. The public is entitled to the maximum possible protection against a recurrence of similar disasters.

The committee is anxious to get all of the facts as soon as possible. If additional legislation is needed, we want to know it. If there is anything more we can do to help get the equipment and

skilled personnel needed to get the job done, we want to do it.

We are not about to enter the jet age. We are already there, as the accident over Pacoima so graphically made clear.

The committee outlined the problem in its report entitled "Airspace Use Study," House Report No. 2972, which I filed January 3.

The committee will continue its study of air safety as rapidly as possible to get at the full facts in the public interest.

PETROLEUM INVESTIGATION

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that on Thursday morning the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have before it the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of Interior for a public presentation of current petroleum matters.

This is the second in the series of hearings which the committee currently is holding with the departments, commissions, and agencies over which the committee has legislative jurisdiction.

It has been the custom of this committee at the beginning of each new Congress to hold such meetings for the purpose of being briefed on the organization and jurisdiction of each such agency, policies, and issues underlying the legislation they administer, and problems they are encountering in their operating experience.

Of our committee's long standing and continuing interest in the subject of petroleum, I do not need here to comment at length. It has been a field which we have had under constant study, not only in connection with the maintenance of a sound domestic industry ready to meet the needs of our country both in periods of emergency and in periods of peacetime economic expansion, but also with respect to the effect upon the adequacy of our supplies, of the worldwide demand for this commodity. In so doing, we have had occasion continually to cover the matter of supplies from the Western Hemisphere, the Middle East, and elsewhere, the demand for petroleum from Europe and the rest of the world, and their collateral effect on our own situation.

In view of the ramifications which have arisen from the closing of the Suez Canal, we have felt we should take up the petroleum subject at the earliest opportunity. We initially will view the picture in broad scope, the domestic supply and demand outlook, the present European demand and deficiencies in supply, the steps being taken to meet such deficiencies and the effect of such steps, and we then shall be in position to determine what further detailed study is appropriate consistent with our legislative duties and our responsibilities to the Members of the House.

NEWSPRINT INVESTIGATION

Now many people have become interested in the question of newsprint, which is one of real and continuous importance. We will have the Department of Commerce and all those who are interested in any phase of the newsprint problems before us, and we intend to continue to investigate and to go into the problem and all facets of the newsprint industry, starting next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the newsprint, I assume that the committee will also seek the opinion of the publishers and editors of the country with particular emphasis upon their specific recommendations.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I have personally been in touch with Mr. Williams of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, whom the gentleman knows very well, and he has offered to cooperate with the committee on the problems of the newspapers throughout the country, large and small.

Mr. McCORMACK. While they justifiably complain, they pass the buck to Congress and will not come forward with any specific recommendations of their own.

Mr. HARRIS. It is going to be our purpose to go into it thoroughly and request them to give us whatever recommendations they have.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say in reply to the majority leader that this morning I received a letter from Mr. Williams inclosing a copy of a resume for the year 1956 down to the 25th of January of this year of what the opinion of the American Newspaper Association is on this point. I have put in the RECORD both the letter and the report, which will appear in tomorrow morning's RECORD.

A year ago I made a statement on the floor of this House, and as far as I know I am the only one who did so, about what the situation was with reference to newsprint. It was far more critical at that time than it is now. However, I think the subcommittee on Finance and Commerce, of which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is the chairman, will make a complete and authoritative investigation of the entire newsprint situation that I am sure will satisfy every Member of this House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have asked the gentleman to yield for a purpose. During the time I have been a Member of Congress, every board and commission of this Government except the Interstate Commerce Commission has been set up, many of them from the committee of which I was a member, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission, and the three laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Securities Act of 1933, the Stock Exchange Regulation Act of 1934, and the Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935.

I trust that the gentleman will set up a subcommittee, and I think under the broad authority of this resolution he has that authority, to go into the administration of each and every one of these laws to see whether or not the law as we

intended it is being carried out or whether a great many of these laws are being repealed or revamped by those who administer them.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say to our distinguished Speaker, in our committee session this morning in the discussion of the establishment of subcommittees and special subcommittees, this particular subject was discussed on the basis that the reorganization act of 1946 directs each committee to keep watch over the agencies of the Government as to the administration of the law. We discussed this problem of setting up a committee for such purpose.

It is my intention as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to set up a special subcommittee to investigate the administration of the laws as intended by Congress which comes under our jurisdiction. As this resolution indicates, many of these agencies come under our jurisdiction. They are established as arms of the Congress and appropriately report to the Congress. We will endeavor to be objective, and I intend to announce the committee in the next few days.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that the Speaker has talked at least on one occasion with me and he expressed some of the doubts mentioned here on the floor this afternoon. I think the committee ought to go back through the years from the time that the law was first put into effect to determine what the trend has been over that period of time. That is perfectly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I think the House would like to know because the agencies which are under the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce cover almost every facet of business in America today. If that is done, and done properly, you could have such a study and it would have a good effect not only so far as this particular committee is concerned, but upon business generally. This is information to which the Congress and the public are entitled.

Mr. HARRIS. I am sure the historical background would be very helpful to the committee in discharging its tremendous responsibility.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I hope the distinguished chairman of this distinguished committee will go into that widespread belief and supposed allegation that many of these air carriers are loading planes beyond their announced capabilities and capacities, and hence they are bound to smash when you put 100 people on a plane announced to carry 70 people.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank my distinguished friend for the fine compliment. It is the intention of the committee to do just what he suggests, and we will begin in the morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the distinguished chairman, when he has the representa-

tives of the petroleum industry before him next week, will inquire into the reason for the increase in gasoline prices a few weeks ago.

Mr. HARRIS. It is the intention of the committee to do that, too, I can assure the gentleman.

AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT, RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT, AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1957, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I, as chairman of the committee, introduced identical bills, H. R. 4101 and H. R. 4102, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. As I stated on the floor of the House on January 30, 1957—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1326—these bills provide for a 10-percent increase in retirement and survivor benefits, an increase in the contribution rate and tax base, and an increase in unemployment insurance benefits. They also contain a provision that employee retirement taxes be excluded from gross income and from wages for Federal income-tax purposes.

This latter provision is a subject matter appropriately within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. In fact, a bill, H. R. 3665, has already been introduced on this subject by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Under the circumstances, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] and I are introducing today new bills—H. R. 4353 and H. R. 4354—which contain the same provisions as H. R. 4101 and H. R. 4102, except that the income tax deduction provision has been deleted from the new bills.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual investigative resolution. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the minority has no requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 94) to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may make investigations and studies into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In Alaska—the aboriginal and possessory rights of the Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians in and to the public lands; in Hawaii—the operation of the Hawaiian Homes Commission under the Hawaiian

Homes Commission Act of 1920, and the return of federally held lands to local authority and/or private ownership; in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and Pacific-flag areas—the provisions and local conditions for an organic act for the trust territory; legislation concerning American Samoa; operation and administration of the Organic Act of Guam; and legislation affecting the civilian population of the Ryukyu Islands; in Puerto Rico—the return of federally held lands to local authority; in the Virgin Islands—the operation and administration of the Revised Organic Act of 1954 and the Virgin Islands Corporation; in the continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands—the operation and administration of the units of the national park system; in the continental United States and Alaska—the mineral resources of the public lands and mining interests generally, including but not limited to the condition, problems, and needs of the mining and minerals industries; the proposed long-range domestic minerals programs to be submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, during the first session of the 85th Congress; mineral resources surveys, exploration, development, production, and conservation minerals research, including coal research, required to improve the position of domestic minerals industries; the administration and operation of Public Law 633 (84th Cong., 2d sess.) with a view to determining the extent to which the intent of Congress to provide interim assistance to those mining industries producing tungsten, fluor spar, asbestos, and columbium-tantalum bearing ores, has been carried out; the administration and operation of Public Law 167 (84th Cong., 1st sess.) known as the Multiple Surface Use Act, and Public Law 359 (84th Cong., 1st sess.), known as the Mining Claims Restoration Act; proposed changes in the general mining laws, and the mineral leasing laws, including the laws which govern the development, utilization, and conservation of the oil, gas, and associated petroleum resources of the public lands and outer Continental Shelf of the United States and Alaska; in the continental United States—irrigation and reclamation projects proposed for authorization, including but not limited to the San Luis project in California, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado, the San Angelo project in Texas, the Norman project in Oklahoma, the Garrison Dam diversion project in North Dakota, the Mid-State project in Nebraska, developments in the Middle and Upper Snake River Basin in Idaho, developments in the Columbia Basin in the vicinity of Wenatchee and Spokane in Washington, and developments in the Rio Grande River Basin in New Mexico, projects proposed for construction under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; disposal of Federal interests in the towns of Boulder City, Nev., and Coulee Dam, Wash., and policies relating to the establishment of such Federal cities at future damsites; applicability to Federal agencies and activities of State and Territorial laws governing the control, appropriation and use of water; in the United States and Alaska—the administration and operation of the laws governing the development, utilization, and conservation of the surface and subsurface resources of the public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the forest reserves created out of the public domain; on various Indian and native lands and reservations in the United States and Alaska—for the purpose of improving the management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; the administration and operation of the Indian health program; and for the purpose of planning the ultimate release of the Indians from Federal wardship.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places

within the United States, its Territories, possessions, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "That" and insert "That, effective from January 4, 1957."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 11, strike out the period and insert a colon and "Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House."

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Rules to withdraw that committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 19, strike out "is in session."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AND TO MAKE INQUIRIES RELATING TO HOUSING

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 86) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including, but not limited to, (1) the status and adequacy of mortgage credit in the United States, (2) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands, and the role of Government-assisted mortgage programs with respect thereto, (3) the operation of the privately financed military housing program, (4) the requirement of and demand for Federal assistance in the development of community facilities, (5) the operation of the slum-clearance and urban renewal programs, and (6) farm housing and the adequacy of farm housing credit. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its

investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 1, after "that" insert "effective from January 4, 1957."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 18, strike out the words "is in session."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further committee amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 2, line 5, strike out lines 5, 6, and 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the resolution continuing the investigation by the Banking and Currency Committee of the housing situation. It is merely a continuation of the investigation that was carried on by the gentleman from Alabama last year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is reported unanimously by the Rules Committee and has the support of the minority of the committee.

I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Schenck].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to inquire of the author of the resolution the general scope of this investigation. May I clarify that by saying that the housing industry is an important industry in the entire national economy. If there are, for example, a million housing units built in a year, that means there will be not only the labor required for the building of these houses but also the labor that is represented in the building of everything that goes into the housing, all the equipment and manufacture of all material; so it is an important part of the entire national economy. This being true, I ask the gentleman as to the scope of his inquiry.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me the time necessary to answer his inquiry?

Mr. SCHENCK. Certainly.

Mr. RAINS. As a member of the subcommittee I am thoroughly aware of the very problem of which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Schenck], speaks and on which he is an authority. It will be the purpose of this committee to look into the possibility of increased mortgage credit which today, as the gentleman knows, is extremely tight all across the country. It will be necessary in the very near future to consider new and different legislation perhaps affecting the Federal National Mortgage Association.

It is also going to become necessary to look further into certain clarifications of the law which it is claimed are needed to carry out the Federal Insurance Act.

This resolution proposes a study of the great field of housing with special emphasis on mortgage credit in order to try to make available to the mortgage credit field funds necessary to build the houses which the gentleman stated form such a large part of our economic effort, and also to help give the opportunity to people who want homes.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I point out to the gentleman further that the discounts on mortgage loans particularly those for veterans' loans are running terrifically high. They are now in some areas discounted as much as 12 percent where the mortgagee is disbursing only 88 percent of the commitment. Other districts are running a little better than that. Recently the FNMA has still further lowered the discount rate on veterans' loans. I assume from what the gentleman has said that that is a part of this inquiry.

Mr. RAINS. We are going to look into that too, I can assure the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. One further question, Mr. Speaker; there seems to be extremely little coordination between the several agencies in the housing field. Public Housing does not seem to know what the FHA is doing and vice versa. Slum clearance and urban redevelopment do not seem to know what the other group is doing, and I am wondering if the gentleman's committee is going to inquire into the administration of those several laws.

Mr. RAINS. We intend to do what the Speaker suggested with reference to another committee, we intend to check to see if the agencies are carrying out the functions of the laws passed by Congress.

I might say to the gentleman also that there are overlapping functions here, that part of this comes under the jurisdiction of the gentleman's Committee on House Administration.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDonough].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I favor the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in accord with the objectives of House Resolution 86. The Committee on Banking and Currency is charged with the physical responsibility of recommending legislation affecting the financial affairs of the economy of the United States. The First Congressional District of California is one of the largest lumber-producing areas in the United States. Thousands of people are engaged in this industry. The economy of the area is dependent upon an active building program. With the tightening money market and the lack of adequate and reasonable financing, the building industry slows down and adversely affects the lumber industry, as well as many of its various related industries.

I trust that this committee will forthwith make its investigations and come back to the Congress with a recommendation to speed up this phase of our economy. I thoroughly and wholeheartedly support this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 67.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1957, the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the procurement, use, and disposition of materiel, equipment, supplies, and services, and the acquisition, use, and disposition of real property, by or within the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

(2) relating to the military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

(3) involving the laws, regulations, and directives administered by or within the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

(4) involving the use of appropriated and nonappropriated funds by or within the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; and

(5) relating to scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned,

to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 1, strike out "3" and insert "4."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed." Page 1, line 8, strike out "the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; and."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 16, after the word "services", insert "Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I would like to withdraw the committee amendment on page 2, line 16.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 3, line 2, strike out "or outside."

Page 3, line 3, strike out "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the customary resolution for the Armed Services Committee to investigate matters within its jurisdiction. That committee has made very successful investigations in past years. It has also saved us a lot of money.

I have no request for time and I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is one of the most important of the several resolutions that we have before us today giving authority to various legislative standing committees of the House. The Committee on Armed Services authorizes the expenditure of more money than any other committee in the House. Of course, the Appropriations Committee handles all appropriations, but the authorizations for all defense matters come from the Committee on Armed Services.

It has been the position of many of us on the Rules Committee that it is the duty and the responsibility of the Committee on Armed Services to see to it just how the money authorized for our national defense is actually being spent. One of the subcommittees set up under the authority of this resolution has been

the Hébert or the Hess committee, as the case might be, which has done a great deal to save the taxpayers of the country untold millions upon millions of dollars. I am hoping that this resolution will not only be voted unanimously but that the chairman of the committee and the full committee will be more zealous than ever in keeping check on the huge funds that we have to vote for defense almost blindly, without complete information as to the need for such appropriations. We favor the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 107 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct full and complete investigations and studies relating to the following matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, namely—

(1) relating to the administration and operation of general immigration and nationality laws and the resettlement of refugees, including such activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which affect immigration in the United States; or involving violation of the immigration laws of the United States through abuse of private relief legislation;

(2) involving claims, both public and private, against the United States;

(3) involving the operation and administration of national penal institutions, including personnel and inmates therein;

(4) relating to judicial proceedings and the administration of Federal courts and personnel thereof, including local courts in Territories and possessions;

(5) relating to the operation and administration of the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act;

(6) involving the operation and administration of Federal statutes, rules, and regulations relating to crime and criminal procedure; and

(7) involving the operation and administration of the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is

authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, following the word "That" insert ", effective from January 4, 1957."

Page 1, line 2, strike out "and directed."

Page 3, beginning on line 5 and ending with the first word on line 6, strike out "or without."

Page 3, line 6, strike out "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment on behalf of the committee:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 2, line 19, after "act", change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of line 19 down to and including the word "House" on line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual investigatory resolution on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary. I know of no objection to it. It was unanimously adopted in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the minority is in support and in favor of this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF ALCOHOL BUTADIENE FACILITY AT LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 138 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2528) to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor 1207. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage.

without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is self-explanatory. It makes in order H. R. 2528 for the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky. I have no request for time, and I know of no opposition to the resolution.

I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas has so ably explained, House Resolution 138 makes in order the bill H. R. 2528 to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., the last, I believe, of the Government-owned rubber plants. This legislation is in line with the policy that has been adopted by the Government. The other plants have all been sold, and I think this cleans up the operation, as I understand it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct. This is an effort to dispose of the butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky., on the same basis and with the same scrutiny that applied to the other synthetic rubber plants. I am going to ask that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, and for that reason I want to make a brief statement in regard to this bill.

This bill was unanimously recommended by the committee. We tried to sell this plant, but we were unable to sell it, and then we tried to lease it and we could not get a satisfactory lease price.

So, therefore, we had to bring in a new bill to broaden the base and permit other chemicals to be manufactured but nevertheless with a national security clause. In this way we hope to be able to get a better offer than the ones we have received heretofore. The Corporation must make its report back to the committee; it must have the opinion from the Attorney General; and any Member of the House has 30 days in which to file any objection to it. And if there is objection, it goes to the committee and has to be reported by us just as in the case of the other rubber plant disposals.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand it, and as the gentleman has explained, the interests of the Government and the taxpayers of this Nation are fully protected in this proposed legislation just as they were protected in previous legislation of the same type.

Mr. VINSON. I can assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If my memory serves me correctly a profit was made on the sale of the other plants; the taxpayers actually gained on the sale of those plants.

Mr. VINSON. I think it was one of the best laws ever enacted in connection with the disposal of Government-owned property. We sold the synthetic-rubber plants for more than \$280 million, undoubtedly the highest price ever received for Government-constructed property of

this nature—some \$25 million more than the net value of the plants.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Far above the value carried on the books of the Government.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2528) be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be known as the "Plancor 1207 Disposal Act of 1957."

SEC. 2. The Federal Facilities Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), successor to the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission pursuant to Executive Order 10678 of September 20, 1956, is hereby authorized and directed, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to take steps immediately to sell, as soon as practicable and in accordance with the provisions of this act, the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor No. 1207 and hereinafter referred to as the "Louisville plant," subject to the existing lease which expires April 4, 1958. The sale thereof shall not limit the use of the plant to the manufacture of alcohol butadiene.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Corporation shall (1) invite and receive proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant; negotiate for its sale and make a recommendation therefor to the Congress; enter into an appropriate contract of sale, which contract shall be binding upon the Government and the prospective purchaser upon execution subject only to the further provisions of this act, and, in the performance of such contract, execute and deliver such deed and other instruments appropriate to transfer title to the purchaser effectively, and (2) take such action and exercise such powers as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act, including specifically the authority to accept a proposal which may not represent the highest price offered.

SEC. 4. (a) The Corporation shall invite, upon adequate notice and advertisement, proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant. The period for the receipt of proposals shall be determined and publicly announced by the Corporation, and shall terminate not less than 30 days after the first day on which proposals may be received pursuant to the advertisement.

(b) Proposals shall be in writing, and shall contain, among other things—

(1) identification of the person in whose behalf the proposal is submitted, including the business affiliation of such person;

(2) the arrangement or plans, if any, formal or informal, for the supply of feedstock to, and the disposition of the end products of, the Louisville plant;

(3) the amount proposed to be paid, and, if such amount is not to be paid in cash, then the principal terms of the financing arrangement proposed;

(4) such other information as the Corporation in its notice and advertisement for proposals shall require be set forth in

proposals, including the prospective purchaser's acceptance of the terms, conditions, restrictions and reservations contained in section 7 of this act, and the interest rate to be charged on the purchase-money mortgage referred to in subsection (e) of this section.

(c) Should it become necessary to the effective prosecution of its duties under this act, the Corporation may, after the termination of the period for the submission of proposals provided for in subsection (a) of this section, disclose the contents of the proposals at such time, in such manner, and to such extent as it deems appropriate.

(d) Proposals shall be accompanied by a deposit of cash or United States Government bonds of face amount equal to 2½ percent of the gross amount proposed to be paid. Except in the case of the purchaser, deposits made hereunder shall be refunded without interest and not later than upon the termination of the period for congressional review as provided in section 5 of this act. In the case of the purchaser, the deposit made hereunder shall be applied without interest to the purchase price: *Provided, however, That upon the closing of the contract of sale the purchaser shall be required to substitute cash equal to the face amount of any Government bonds then held in connection with such purchaser's proposal.*

(e) Payment of the purchase price may be made in part by a first lien purchase-money mortgage, in an amount not to exceed 75 percent of the purchase price. The terms of any such mortgage obligation, to be determined by negotiation, shall provide among other things for a maturity of not more than 10 years, periodic amortization, and a uniform interest rate of not less than 4 percent per annum.

(f) Promptly after the termination of the period for the receipt of proposals, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, and for such period thereafter, which shall be not less than 30 days, as may be determined and publicly announced by the Corporation, it shall negotiate with those submitting proposals for the purpose of entering into a definitive contract of sale.

(g) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to prevent the Corporation from securing such additional information from those submitting proposals at any time as the Corporation may deem necessary or appropriate to fulfill its responsibilities under this act.

SEC. 5. Within 40 days after the termination of the actual negotiating period referred to in subsection (f) of section 4 of this act, the Corporation shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report containing, with respect to the disposal under this act of the Louisville plant, the information described in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 8 of section 9 (a) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Disposal Act"), together with a statement from the Attorney General approving the proposed disposal as not tending to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. The report to the Congress shall be submitted in accordance with section 9 (b) of the Disposal Act, and unless the contract is disapproved by either House of the Congress by a resolution, as defined in section 23 of the Disposal Act, prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 9 (c) of the Disposal Act) of the Congress following the date upon which the report is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the contract shall become fully effective and the Corporation shall proceed to carry it out, and transfer of title to the Louisville plant shall be made as soon as practicable, but in any event within 30 days after the expiration or termination of the existing lease on the Louisville plant. The failure to complete transfer of title within

30 days after the expiration or termination of the existing lease shall not give rise to or be the basis of rescission of the contract of sale.

SEC. 6. The Corporation, before submission to the Congress of its report relative to the Louisville plant, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 30 days after receiving the report, advise the Corporation whether the proposed sale would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Throughout the course of disposal proceedings on the Louisville plant, the Corporation shall consult with the Attorney General in order (1) that the Corporation may secure guidance as to the application of the standard set forth in this section, and (2) that the Corporation may supply the Attorney General with such information as he may deem requisite to enable him to provide the advice contemplated by this section.

SEC. 7. The contract of sale for the Louisville plant and instruments in execution thereof shall contain a national security clause having terms, conditions, restrictions, and reservations which will assure the prompt availability of the Louisville plant, or facilities of equivalent capacity, for the production of one or more chemical products important to the national security, for a period of 10 years from the date of transfer of title of the Louisville plant. As used in this act, the term "chemical products important to the national security" shall mean (1) chemicals for which expansion goals have been established under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, during the calendar years 1951-55, inclusive, or (2) chemicals for the production of which a material has been determined to be strategic and critical under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of 1947, or (3) any other chemical which the President may, upon request from the Corporation, or, during the period of the national security clause, upon request from the purchaser, approve as important to the national defense.

SEC. 8. Such sums as may be required to finance the Corporation's activities hereunder shall be provided out of the proceeds heretofore realized from disposal of the Government-owned synthetic rubber facilities, and all final net proceeds from sale of the Louisville plant shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 9. The provisions of section 6 of the Disposal Act are hereby made fully applicable to the activities of the Corporation and its employees in the sale of the Louisville plant under this act.

SEC. 10. Public Law 433, 84th Congress, with the exception of section 6 (a), (b) and (c) thereof, is hereby repealed; and Federal Facilities Corporation shall be substituted for the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission therein.

SEC. 11. In the event of dissolution of the Federal Facilities Corporation, the powers hereby conferred by this act shall be exercised by such successor agency of the Government as may be designated by the President.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD in its entirety and open at this point to any amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

On page 4, lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "a uniform" and insert in lieu thereof the word "an."

On page 5, line 21, strike out "approving the proposed disposal as not tending" and insert in lieu thereof "advising whether the proposed disposal would tend."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2528 is a bill to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility located at Louisville, Ky. This is the last of the Government-built rubber plants which will require legislative action and I am hopeful that it will be passed so that we may complete the disposal program which began in 1953.

You will recall that in the last Congress we passed Public Law 433, which permitted the Rubber Disposal Commission to sell or lease this facility located at Louisville, Ky.

Thereafter, the Commission entered into a sales contract with Union Carbide and Carbon Corp. However, this proposed sale was rejected by our committee and the House based upon the fact that the Attorney General could not approve the sale since in his opinion it did not meet all of the criteria of the Disposal Act.

Union Carbide had agreed to pay \$3,500,000 for the facility including inventory and spare parts, but they could not enter into a contract which would assure the production of alcohol butadiene. The reason they could not do this was because alcohol butadiene is more expensive to produce and therefore must sell for a higher price than petroleum butadiene.

Then the Commission went out of business and the Federal Facilities Corporation, as the successor to the Commission, took bids for a long-term lease of the facility. But in January of this year, the Corporation reported to the Congress that they could not recommend awarding a lease because only two bidders offered to lease the plant and in both instances the Corporation felt that the return to the Government did not represent anything like the value of the facility.

One of the bidders offered a guaranteed rental of \$2,000 a month, with the Government continuing to pay all maintenance costs and taxes. These amount to \$342,000 a year. So you can understand why this bid was rejected. The other bidder offered more, but still not enough to satisfy the Corporation.

Now alcohol butadiene was important during World War II because there was not an adequate supply of petroleum butadiene. As you know, butadiene is a major feedstock in the production of synthetic rubber. But today the situation is entirely different. By 1959 we will have more petroleum butadiene available from privately owned sources in this country than the anticipated demand.

As a matter of fact, by 1959 the Office of Defense Mobilization estimates that the production of petroleum butadiene will exceed the demand by 146,000 tons. And on top of this, the Koppers Co. purchased an alcohol-butadiene plant from the Government in 1955 with a national security clause which does not expire until 1965, which requires the Koppers Co.

to keep that plant available for the emergency production of alcohol butadiene in the amount of 80,000 tons annually. And in addition to this, we know that large quantities of butadiene can be obtained from butane, which can be obtained from natural gas.

For that reason, we propose in this legislation, to offer the plant for sale without the requirement that it be kept available for the production of alcohol butadiene. However, we do require a 10-year national security clause which will keep the facility available for the production of a chemical or chemicals important to the national security.

Now, by eliminating the restriction that the plant be kept available for the production of alcohol butadiene it is our opinion that the Government will receive a much better price for this facility than anything heretofore offered.

The sale of this plant will be similar to the sales of the other rubber plants. Bids will be received for not less than 30 days after they have been advertised; negotiations will be conducted for not less than 30 days; the Attorney General will have 30 days in which to submit his advice to the Corporation on the proposed sale, and the Congress will have 30 days to reject any proposed sale by the Corporation.

You will note that we amended one portion of the bill dealing with the Attorney General's position in this matter.

The bill as originally introduced required the approval of the Attorney General with respect to whether or not any proposed sale would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. The Attorney General felt that this was a determination that should be made by the Congress and he in effect suggested that he submit his advice as to whether or not any proposed sale would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws, but not require his approval for the submission of the proposed sale to the Congress. We concurred in his views and amended the bill accordingly.

Now, I cannot tell you how much we are going to get from this plant, but I am satisfied that the price will be in excess of \$3,500,000, not only because we have eliminated some of the restrictive language, but also because, under the proposed law, we will attract more bidders. Several, so I am told, have already indicated an interest in this facility.

There is some urgency in connection with the legislation because the plant is presently under a lease which will expire in April of 1958. Because of the necessity for engineering estimates, setting up an organization, preparing for feedstocks and getting set for modifications, repairs, and so forth, we would expect to get a much better price for the facility if the sale can be completed before this session of the Congress adjourns. If we wait until next year, we may lose a lot of bidder interest, and as a result may get less for the facility than the amount we can now reasonably expect.

To summarize briefly: this is the last plant in the rubber program; it will be

offered for sale subject to a national security clause; the Attorney General's advice must be contained in the report to the Congress, and the Congress will retain the right to disapprove the sale by action in either House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE THURMOND CHATHAM

Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow and regret that I inform the House of the death of the Honorable Thurmond Chatham. Mr. Chatham was a former Member of this body who rendered his country as well as his State and district long and valuable service. His passing is a great shock to his many friends and a serious loss to his State and the Nation.

I join his family and a host of friends in mourning his loss.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, it is with a sense of deep sorrow that I address you. A great man—a good man—has this day fallen. He was my friend and for many long years I enjoyed his friendship. Thurmond Chatham has passed into the great realm of silence and to his great reward. Thurmond Chatham was indeed a great and a good man. His life was a blessing and a benediction. To his State, his Nation, and to all humanity Thurmond Chatham was a patriot and above all an American in the truest and noblest sense of the word. In two great world wars he offered himself upon the altars of liberty and he died believing in the great cause of freedom. He was not only a gallant soldier in the cause of freedom, but he was a statesman—honest and courageous and fearless—and for 8 long years he served right here with us.

I have never known a man with whom I have had the privilege of serving who had a greater capacity for making friends than did our beloved former Congressman. Thurmond Chatham was a devoted and dedicated public servant and he enjoyed serving his country in times of war as in times of peace because he knew that he was at all times engaged in a noble pursuit. He was not only a very kind man, a very friendly person, but he was one of the most generous men I have ever known. His real joy came from making other people happy. I have known him for many long years and as I now recall our many friendly hours and days together, and as I now realize that he will never move

among us again I am reminded of a few words of a poem which was written by Thomas Moore:

Let Fate do her worst, there are relics of joy,
Sweet dreams of the past which she cannot destroy;

Dreams that come in the nighttime of sorrow
and care,
And bring back the features that joy used
to wear.

Long, long be my heart with such memories
filled,

Like the vase in which roses have once been
distilled.

You may break, you may shatter, the vase
if you will,

But the scent of the roses will hang round it
still.

Wherever Thurmond Chatham went he made a broad thoroughfare for friendship. People everywhere loved him, respected and admired him. During his very useful life he visited many parts of the world and wherever he went he made friends. So around the world tonight friends will share the sorrow which has been caused by his passing. But his great generosity he contributed to the happiness of little orphan children in far distant lands and no man was ever too lowly to be called his friend. He had a very dynamic personality and yet he was one of the friendliest men I have ever known. Fate may take him from us but the joy of having known him will always remain with us.

Thurmond Chatham was a member of a great family. Thousands of friends will share the sorrow of his lovely wife, his devoted sons and all of the members of his family. I want to express my very deep, profound and heartfelt sympathy to Pat, his wife, to his three fine sons, to all of the loved ones he left behind. Our world is better because Thurmond Chatham lived and moved and worked among us.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues from North Carolina in taking note of the sudden and untimely passing of my late good friend, the Honorable Thurmond Chatham. Thurmond Chatham was a leader in his local community. He was a leader in the State of North Carolina, and he was a leader in the Nation. His interests were many.

I am sure all of you are as familiar as I was with his military record and his patriotic interest in the military life of this country.

He was a business leader in its finest sense.

I know of my own knowledge of the excellent relations between management and labor at the plants which he operated in the State of North Carolina.

His name will long be remembered by the people of our State and by the people of other States of this great Union.

I, therefore, say with a heart full of sadness that I feel a great personal loss in his passing. Even keener than the loss that we now feel is the feeling of loss

which is experienced and will be experienced in the future by the splendid family now making its mark in North Carolina and in this Nation in many worthy and worthwhile activities.

In conclusion, I would like to say a personal word. I, like many others who have been blessed with the friendship of this great and good man, can ill afford to lose such friends.

The words of one of our poets has well typified Thurmond Chatham when he wrote:

Here was a man whose heart was good,
Who walked with men and understood.
His was a voice that spoke to cheer,
And fell like music to the ear.
His was a smile men loved to see,
His was a hand that asked no fee
For friendliness or kindness done.
And now that he has journeyed on,
His is a fame that never ends
And leaves behind uncounted friends.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Thurmond Chatham is a sad one. It leaves a void in the minds and hearts of those who knew him. Thurmond Chatham was not only a great son of North Carolina, he was one of the great Americans of his day and age. He served in this body with outstanding distinction. He served with great ability and unusual courage. He served on the important committee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which has played such a vital part in the trying period through which America and the rest of the world are now going through. Thurmond Chatham has left his imprint on the pages of the legislative history of our country. He has brought great credit to his district, to his family, and to his friends. During my period of service with him in this body we became close personal friends. His was a friendship that I value greatly. It will leave a memory that I shall always treasure. His personality was outstanding. His gentle charm was inspiring. As one of our colleagues well said, Thurmond Chatham was not only a great man—he was a good man. I am deeply grieved in the passing of this dear and beloved friend of mine. North Carolina has lost a great son, but the country has equally lost a great citizen. To his loved ones left behind I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in this tribute to our friend, Thurmond Chatham. He was a graduate of Yale. I knew him in those days and then served with him in this body and on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Thurmond Chatham had a remarkable intellect and a wonderfully quick grasp of the broad fundamentals. He was fearless in fighting for the principles in which he believed, but he had an enormous capacity for friendship which encircled all who knew him. I, together with my colleagues, join in my expression of sympathy for his fine wife and his loved ones that he leaves behind.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like at this point to join with those who have paid tribute to our former colleague. Like those who have spoken before and who have served in this House with Thurmond Chatham, I learned not only to respect him but to love him. Those of us who have observed, as we have run our race through life, I am sure have noted that nature never yields to any one person all of the talents. She is a great believer in disbursing those talents among her many creatures. One is given the talent of a particularly bright mind; one of a splendid physical prowess; another of a great capacity for love and passionate friendship of his fellow man. And it is fortunate, that nature does not endow any one of us with all of the virtues; otherwise we would all be subservient to the one. But of the many talents that our friend Thurmond Chatham did possess, it seems to me the most outstanding one was his capacity for love of his fellow man. A man possessed of more than the average of this world's material things, yet he was as democratic as any man I ever knew in his dealings with his fellow man. It was my high privilege and my distinct pleasure to have served with and to have known—yes, to have been a houseguest of this splendid friend of man. I like to think of him in the terms of the poet who wrote the beautiful little poem of "The man who lived by the side of the road and was a friend of man."

I join with all of my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to the loved ones he has left behind to mourn his untimely passing.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I want to express a feeling of personal loss, as I know is felt by so many of our colleagues, who had the privilege of associating with Thurmond Chatham. His was a warmth of friendship that is rare, and my life has been enriched by that association.

I extend my sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I join in the beautiful tributes which have been made to our former colleague, Thurmond Chatham. I think the characterization of his love for his fellowman, as made by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], so ably describes his character and his capacity to genuinely love his fellowman. He had a vivaciousness about him which makes it so difficult for all of us who sat with him to believe that he has gone to his great reward.

As has been so ably said, he was a man of many beautiful characteristics, but I think all of us will remember him as a friend and as a man who loved life.

To his lovely wife and his family I, too, join in expressions of deepest sympathy.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND TRIBUTES TO MR. CHATHAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

extend their remarks at this point on the life, character, and public service of the late Thurmond Chatham.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me deep pain to learn of the passing of my dear friend, Thurmond Chatham. His fine personality and his gracious goodwill will be missed by all of us. To his family to whom he was so deeply devoted, I send my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, Thurmond Chatham personified to me the highest type of southern gentleman. He was kind and genial and made friends without trying. I have in these last few years felt real close to Thurmond even though my association with him was not extensive. He was that kind of man. He possessed that high type of attraction whereby those who hardly knew him would classify him as a close friend.

Only in recent weeks he invited me to visit his home and it was an invitation I intended to accept so elevating was his presence.

To his lovely wife and family, I offer my deepest sympathy and trust that the many who share his loss will serve to lift some of the heavy load that has been placed upon them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn today of the passing of our former distinguished colleague and my good friend, Hon. Thurmond Chatham. I served with him in this body for 8 years. He was always a most affable and courteous gentleman and was held in high esteem by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Thurmond Chatham was a fine statesman, of unsullied and unquestioned patriotism and integrity, and rendered great service to his district, his State of North Carolina, and the country. We shall all miss him. I extend to his widow and family my sincere sympathy upon their great loss.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved by the news of the passing of my dear and loyal friend, Thurmond Chatham, who for 8 years represented his great district and the fine people of North Carolina. His untimely passing is a decided loss to North Carolina and to the Nation.

"Thurm," as most of us loved to call him, was one of the nicest guys that ever graced Capitol Hill from any State. He was kind, considerate, and generous. He was always interested in the problems and the heartaches of the other fellow. One would never suspect that he was a man of great wealth, due to his sympathetic understanding and his down-to-earth feeling with respect to the problems of others. Because of this and his many other fine traits, "Thurm" had the admiration and the affection of every Member of this House on both sides of this aisle. He was a man of honor, integrity, ability, and one of the most courageous persons that it has ever been my good fortune to meet and know. During World Wars I and II he served his country under fire, displaying great physical courage. Later, as a Member of this great body, he personally demon-

strated the actual and exact meaning of political courage. Truly this good man had real class and rare judgment.

He was a God-fearing, God-loving man.

In my humble opinion, Thurmond Chatham was a laborer in the vineyard of the Master, where the laborers are few and the harvest abundant.

Surely the good Lord has set aside for him in that great mansion of rest special quarters. His acts of kindness, consideration, and respect for his less fortunate brothers were the password for him to enter that great lodge above.

To his splendid family—each and every one—I extend my deep and sincere sympathy.

May God rest his sweet soul in peace.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to know the Honorable Thurmond Chatham for the past 10 years. He served with great distinction as a member of the Board of Conservation and Development of North Carolina and, of course, as we all know, had a long and honorable service in this great body. He served with great distinction in the United States Navy in two World Wars.

Thurmond Chatham was undoubtedly one of North Carolina's leading industrialists and a man who always practiced his belief of human kindness and consideration in his dealings with his hundreds of employees and countless friends. North Carolina, as well as our Nation, has lost an outstanding and able public servant, and I join with my many distinguished colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy to his fine wife and sons.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad occasion for the friends of Thurmond Chatham here today in this body, but also it is a pleasure for us to be here honoring the memory of the man who is so worthy of honor. It is always a pleasure to me to read and hear the praise of a man who so richly deserves it, but because we have lost a friend there is deep sadness mingled with the pleasure of praise.

We know that many others have appreciated what we also appreciate in Thurmond Chatham—an individual whose overflow of human kindness to all beings of whatever race, creed, or color was well known.

I first met Thurmond Chatham when he entered the University of North Carolina as a freshman, more than 40 years ago. During all these years our relations were most pleasant and intimate and they were enriched by my later association with him here in the Halls of Congress.

Thurmond was a man who did not change his mind to suit men and circumstances. He relied upon the rewards given to men who do not flinch before the cries of the multitude and who do not seek their political fortune in the success of the moment. He always walked straight in what he thought was the right path as a patriotic citizen and a truly responsible legislator. His was a high standard of probity, political honesty, and abhorrence of political corruption. He comprehended the full scope of every undertaking and he had the courage to carry it on to a legitimate end. With a

kindly heart and a sympathy so comprehensive, he gained and retained the friendship of many men associated with him, not only here in the Congress but throughout his whole life. Our friend was true to every institution of liberty, true to the whole trust which reposed in him, vigilant of the Constitution, and he has left a very worthy record, with complete consistency, in an era that has exacted the best of men's brain and heart.

We may hope that these qualities of our honorable friend and colleague will create forces that will produce a better and purer citizenship and give us a renewed faith in the American people as custodians of a free government.

Thurmond Chatham was a dedicated believer in the House of Representatives, where he served effectively for four terms, and he believed that the House of Representatives is the heart and soul of this Republic of America, and that as long as American people keep it that way, freedom is safe. He was true to his friends and they were true to him. I feel a deep personal loss and my sincere sympathy is extended to his wife and family.

Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Thurmond Chatham was born in Elkin, N. C., August 16, 1896; educated in the public schools and attended the University of North Carolina and Yale University; during the First World War enlisted in the United States Navy as seaman second class, and served from May 1917 to June 1919; in World War II again served in the Navy from February 14, 1942, to November 25, 1945, with combat duty in the southwest Pacific; decorated with the Bronze Star Medal, the Secretary of the Navy's Commendation Medal, and the Royal Order of Nassau with Swords from the Dutch Government, American theater ribbon, European theater ribbon, Asiatic theater ribbon with three battle stars, World War I ribbon, and the Victory ribbon; went to work in the mills of the Chatham Manufacturing Co. in July 1919 and rose through various positions to the presidency of the company and chairman of the board of directors; married to Mrs. Patricia Firestone Coyner, November 16, 1950; one son, Walter Firestone Chatham, and two sons by former marriage, Hugh Gwyn Chatham and Richard Thurmond Chatham, Jr.; engaged in agricultural pursuits as owner and operator of Klondike Farm at Elkin, N. C.; former president of North Carolina Dairymen's Association, member of State Board of Conservation and Development, and county commissioner of Forsyth County; a member of the National Grange, the Farm Bureau, the visiting committee of Woman's College at Greensboro, and director of Hugh Chatham Memorial Hospital at Elkin; member, Society of Cincinnati; elected to 81st Congress on November 2, 1948; reelected to the 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses.

I succeeded Thurmond Chatham in Congress and feel that I knew him better than many of you. I knew him personally as a friend and also as a political opponent. In the light of that knowledge, I can sincerely say to you that he possessed the grace of friend-

ship, had the sense of oneness with our kind, and his mind and heart were linked with his fellow heart and mind. He was one of that select number who might sincerely join in that prayerful petition:

Teach me to feel another's woe,
To hide the fault I see;
The mercy I to others show,
That mercy show to me.

He did not seek the faults of his fellow men, but he did seek their woes and shared them with understanding, tolerance, and unselfish helpfulness. In the poet's language, he could have said, and probably did say, "I pray thee, then, write me as one that loves his fellow men."

I have never known a more sportsmanlike man than Thurmond Chatham. He could dish it out, but he could also take it. He was gracious and humble in victory. He was gracious and graceful in defeat—and I do not refer to political campaigns alone, but to all of the vicissitudes of life. His follies, if any, were so far overshadowed by his contributions to the sum total of human happiness and welfare that they must be considered negligible. He was a splendid and loveable gentleman, a fine friend, a courageous and conscientious public servant, one who never looked back and who continuously thought that this mid-20th century should be a period of progress.

I join with you in mourning his loss and in perpetuating in memory his fine qualities of character. For myself and on behalf of the people of my district, I salute the memory of Thurmond Chatham, who devoted the best efforts of his life to the cause of better relations among his own people and among those of the world. He was a man whose example in tolerance, compassion, and charity were his eloquent answer to the centuries-old query: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Surely "he loved the stars too fondly to be fearful of the night."

From his widow, his fine sons, his family and host of friends, I bring you thanks and gratitude for your kindness, understanding, and friendship for Thurmond Chatham, who understood well that to have a friend one must be a friend.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the qualities of mind and heart that so firmly established Thurmond Chatham in our esteem and affection have been aptly described by his colleagues from his beloved State of North Carolina. I join them in the expressions of deep sorrow over his passing. North Carolina and the Nation have suffered a great loss. His life was one of usefulness and devotion. He was courageous, conscientious, kind and generous. He was a man of vision, with confidence in his country's future and faith in our capacity for sound progress. The Foreign Affairs Committee, on which he served during his entire membership in the House, benefitted greatly by his wise counsel, and the legislative history of the period bears the impress of his splendid contribution. His memory will be cherished.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of our former friend and colleague, Hon. Thurmond Chatham, of North Carolina.

He had great ability and qualities which endeared him to all. He had a fine military record, serving in the United States Navy for 2 years in World War I and for 3 years in World War II, being awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Secretary of the Navy's Commendation Medal. He was entitled to the American and European Theater Ribbons; the Asiatic Theater Ribbon with three battle stars; and the World War I and Victory Ribbons. He was also decorated by the Netherlands Government with the Royal Order of Nassau With Swords.

A highly successful businessman, formerly president of the Chatham Manufacturing Co. in Elkin, N. C., with many interests in his community and elsewhere, he was elected to the 81st Congress, serving in this body for 8 years and making a further and very fine contribution to his country and to the free world as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

We were old friends, our friendship dating back to the period before World War II. I shall miss him greatly, as will his wide circle of friends, both those who served with him here in the Congress and those who knew him in his other activities.

I join in heartfelt sympathy to his wife and all his family.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of my good friend Thurmond Chatham was a great shock. I personally feel that I have lost one of my best friends.

I have known Thurmond Chatham since I was a young man and through all these years he has meant a great to me. He served with distinction in both of the Great Wars and I have worked with him in the American Legion in a very intimate way.

Thurmond Chatham was a great American. He was loyal to his community and to his people. I have never known of any worthy cause that Thurmond Chatham did not respond to. He loved people; he loved good government; he radiated friendliness; was always cheerful and a good companion.

While I was serving as a freshman in this great body he was most helpful to me. He was generous not only with his time but with his substance for any worthy cause.

As few men have been able to do, he lived out his life without taking advantage of his fellowman; he succeeded in business and retained the friendship, goodwill, and love of his benefactors and those he befriended. His active interest in civic matters was always a topic of pride and appreciation in his native North Carolina.

His passing has brought much sorrow to all who knew him and to the thousands who benefited from the many years of his fruitful and unselfish public service.

If there was any characteristic which particularly stood out to mark Thurmond Chatham I would say it was his ability to make and hold friends. He had a personal charm all his own, a friendly smile, and a genial handshake.

The State of North Carolina and the Nation has lost a true patriot in his passing. I join with a multitude of friends in paying a final tribute to my friend,

Thurmond Chatham. His memory will remain as a choice possession of all who knew and loved him.

To his lovely wife and three sons I express my deepest sympathy.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of personal loss that I learned earlier today of the sudden and untimely passing of our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Thurmond Chatham, of Elkin, N. C.

Congressman Chatham was elected to the 81st Congress and served from that time until his retirement as one of the most active, able, and conscientious members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He served as chairman of the important Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations and during his service undertook a number of highly important study missions abroad for the committee.

Congressman Chatham endeared himself to all who had the pleasure and privilege of working and serving with him. He was known to us for his outstanding and heroic record of naval service in both World Wars. Before coming to Congress he had achieved outstanding success as a businessman and served for many years as president and chairman of the board of the Chatham Manufacturing Co.

He leaves behind a host of friends who will share with his widow and other members of his family a deep personal sense of loss. Our most heartfelt condolences and sympathy go out to the dear ones of his family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the body of today's RECORD in two instances:

First at a point during general debate on the bill H. R. 4249, following the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], and immediately before the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and to include two telegrams.

Mr. Speaker, second, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD at a point immediately following the Clerk's reading of the so-called Rooney amendment to line 3, page 5, of the bill H. R. 4249.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

IRAN

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, at page 1485 of the RECORD for yesterday appears a statement by our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE]. I shall not concern myself with all of Mr. REECE's comments, but I do want to call attention to the statement attributed to Mr. Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, and purporting to be a summary of his testimony before our subcommittee on May 29, 1956. From a personal standpoint, I certainly have no objections to the publication of Mr. Murphy's statement, but because all testimony at the hearing in question was taken in executive session it would be improper to release any part of it without authority by the committee itself.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] is in error if he supposes that this document was omitted from the printed transcript through inadvertence. Obviously, he is not too well informed on this point—which is understandable—since he was not present at the hearing held on May 29. To the best of my knowledge, he did not request for study a transcript of that hearing, and consequently any information which he has about it must have been supplied by someone in the Department of State.

I think the House ought to note that the May 29 hearing of the Subcommittee on International Operations, of which I was chairman, was strictly an executive session to permit the subcommittee freedom of discussion of certain classified information in connection with its comprehensive examination of the extensive foreign-aid program in Iran. This hearing immediately preceded the open hearings and at this session the subcommittee discussed in considerable detail the manner in which it would proceed in open hearings in order to avoid any possibility of improper public disclosures. At the opening of this session I explained this purpose to Mr. Murphy and to others who accompanied him, which included Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Loy W. Henderson; Director of the International Cooperation Administration John Hollister; Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations Robert C. Hill; Director of the United States Operations Mission in Iran Clark Gregory; and others.

Mr. Murphy's testimony at this session was substantially confined to a statement he had prepared for the occasion setting forth certain operating difficulties experienced in the Iran aid program and their relation to the foreign policy aspects of the Iran aid allocations.

There was so much confidential information discussed at this executive session that the subcommittee could not have it included in the printed hearings. Any attempt to delete classified material would have destroyed all continuity. As a consequence, and in keeping with committee rules, none of the testimony taken in that hearing was released. There was never any official transmission to me or to the committee of the statement inserted by the gentleman

from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], although I was advised that the Iranian desk officer of the Department of State submitted to a member of the subcommittee staff a single copy of a mimeographed document which was represented to be a paraphrase of Mr. Murphy's statement in executive session, and which was presumed to have had classified or sensitive information deleted.

Since none of the remaining testimony taken at this session had been cleared, or indeed could be coherently cleared for public printing, the separate release of Mr. Murphy's statement, which is not the statement delivered before the subcommittee, does not seem to be in order.

I think I should point out also that in the preparation of this report the subcommittee took into account all of the information gathered at the executive sessions as well as that presented in the open sessions. Indeed, considerable reliance for the language of the report itself was placed upon Mr. Murphy's statement given at that time. The subcommittee is of the opinion that its report takes into account substantially all of the pertinent material which was presented by Mr. Murphy at this hearing and at other times when the subcommittee had the benefit of his advice and counsel.

The statement attributed to Mr. Murphy and inserted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] should not be identified as a statement submitted by Mr. Murphy to the subcommittee. It must have been received by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] from other sources because he certainly did not receive it from the subcommittee. If it were an excerpt from the testimony taken on May 29, it would be improper for him to have released it because that testimony was taken in executive session.

THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on August 28, 1956, during the adjournment of Congress, former Representative George Holden Tinkham died suddenly at Cramerton, N. C., where for part of each year he has made his home with his sister.

For 28 years, from 1915 to 1943, in the 64th through the 77th Congress, our departed colleague ably served as the Republican representative of what was originally the 11th District of Massachusetts, but during his tenure became the 10th District.

It is interesting to note that only 2 Members of the present Congress were Members of the first Congress in which Mr. Tinkham served, the 64th, and they both were Members of the 63d Congress,

namely our distinguished Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, CARL VINSON of Georgia. But many present Members served in the House with Mr. Tinkham—all those who are now in their 9th or succeeding terms.

George Holden Tinkham was born in Boston on October 29, 1870, the son of George Henry and Frances Ann (Holden) Tinkham. He graduated from Harvard College in 1894 and subsequently attended Harvard Law School, and was admitted to the Massachusetts bar.

He soon became interested in politics, and in 1897 was elected to the Boston Common Council. He later served on the board of aldermen, in the Massachusetts Senate, and was elected to Congress in 1915. The district included nine wards of Boston, and although it was undoubtedly Democratic on the whole, Representative Tinkham's popularity was such that he was reelected again and again by large majorities, and during his later years in Congress, did no campaigning in person. During campaigns he could usually be found shooting big game in Africa, or traveling elsewhere abroad.

Representative Tinkham was an outspoken and colorful figure in the House. Coming from a long line of American ancestors, he once claimed to stand "with one foot on Bunker Hill and the other on Plymouth Rock." He was an outstanding foe of prohibition, and a champion of immigrants and others whom he felt were being discriminated against.

While campaigning in the district formerly represented by Mr. Tinkham, I have seen striking evidence of the esteem and affection in which he was held. Older voters especially, many of them Democrats, would tell me with extreme pride and pleasure that they "always used to vote for Mr. Tinkham." The highest compliment which they could pay me would be to say that they felt I was carrying on in his manner. I shall ever be personally grateful to Mr. Tinkham for having publicly endorsed me in my campaigns in his old district.

From first to last George Holden Tinkham was a man of honor and integrity, and of gay gallantry. His was a personality which forever enriches our American tradition.

I include as part of my remarks the article about Mr. Tinkham published in the New York Times of August 29, 1956. It is dated Cramerton, N. C., August 28, 1956.

George Holden Tinkham, lawyer, big-game hunter, and globetrotter who had served 14 terms in the United States House of Representatives, died here in his sleep today at the home of a sister, Mrs. Stuart W. Cramer, Sr. His age was 85.

A descendant of a family that came to America on the Mayflower, he represented the 10th Massachusetts District—including Boston's Back Bay and fashionable Newton—from 1915 to 1943, when he retired from political life. He was not married.

Another sister, Mrs. Madeleine P. Miller, of Boston, also survives.

LEADER OF WET BLOC

An unyielding isolationist, Mr. Tinkham was a leader of the wet bloc in prewar days, a defender of Negro rights and a foe of all restrictions on personal liberty. One

of his proudest distinctions was that of having fired the first American shot against Austria in World War I. At the time, April 1917, he was touring Italy when the United States declared war.

His campaign methods brought him almost as much attention as his congressional activities. His usual procedure in an election year was to embark on a big-game hunt or a long trip abroad after Congress had adjourned. Either just before or just after election he would return.

Without having made a single campaign speech, he would be reelected as a Republican from the Tenth District, a section normally Democratic. In 1928, 1932, and 1936 his district gave heavy pluralities to Democratic presidential and senatorial candidates, but returned him to the House by an even heavier vote.

When, in April 1942, Mr. Tinkham announced he would retire from public life the next year, he declared that "younger shoulders" should carry the burden. He added that "redistricting" had made him "a comparative stranger" to a large part of his new constituency.

Last March Mr. Tinkham made available to the New York Times a prediction by Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry, the American naval officer who opened Japan to the West, that war "must sooner or later inevitably be fought" between this country and Russia. Mr. Tinkham said he could not recall how he had acquired this portion of an address delivered by Commodore Perry in 1856.

One of the richest men in the Congress, Mr. Tinkham was also one of the most picturesque. His was the last bearded face there. Until the death of Senator J. Hamilton Lewis, of Illinois, they shared this distinction.

NAMED TROPHIES FOR FOES

He was one of the most traveled men in the country. Even before he entered Harvard College in 1890 he had journeyed from Spitsbergen to New Zealand, usually in quest of big game. On some of his trips he covered as much as 40,000 miles. Big game and other trophies were brought back from these expeditions and preserved.

One of his whims was naming the more grotesque items in his collection for political opponents. In this category were many notable figures, including Bishop James Cannon, Jr., of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, whom Mr. Tinkham had assailed mercilessly during prohibition days; President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson.

His later years in Congress were devoted chiefly to fighting the foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration. In 1938 he charged that the President and the State Department were under the control of the British Foreign Office. He frequently mentioned the existence of international plots against the peace of the United States, and was one of the leaders in the fights against lifting the arms embargo and against the lease-lend bill to aid Great Britain in the war against Germany.

His isolationist record dated from the end of World War I. He opposed United States participation in the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague, the Netherlands; the Washington Naval Treaties, the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact and recognition of Soviet Russia.

Mr. Tinkham was born in Boston, on October 29, 1870, the son of George Henry and Frances Ann Holden Tinkham. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Harvard in 1894, and later attended Harvard Law School. He was admitted to the Massachusetts bar in 1899. Two years previously he had won his first political office, membership on Boston's common council.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD during the course of the tribute being paid to the late Honorable George Holden Tinkham, or, if they so desire, at any other time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and that all Members who speak during the course of this tribute may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, when George Holden Tinkham died last August there passed from this scene one of the most colorful and picturesque figures of our national life. For 28 years he served with great ability and distinction in the Congress of the United States. Previously he had served in the city government in Boston and in the Massachusetts State Senate.

George Tinkham was a positive character, a man of strong views and with the courage to fight for them. He was a foe of prohibition and took a very prominent part in the fight.

Tinkham won fame as a hunter and traveler. The trophies he brought back from his many hunts afforded his friends vast information concerning animal life. His travels brought him to all parts of the world. Two years ago I recall running across him when he was leaving to make an air trip over the Arctic, the last place for him to visit; and he made that trip at the age of 84. Nearly every year he visited South Africa where he had an interest in a gold mine.

Mr. Tinkham was a student of economics. He visited Washington, New York, London, and other great cities every year to gather his information data.

He prided himself upon calling far in advance of the 1929 collapse as well as an advance prediction of the coming of the First World War.

Tinkham could well be classified as an isolationist. From his Pilgrim ancestry he inherited a rugged independence that won for him the respect of friend and foe alike. His colorful beard gave him a ferocious appearance, but in reality he had a heart of sentiment and good will. He was devoutly loyal to his friends.

His popularity at home was such that regularly year after year a Democratic district in Boston returned him to Congress with hardly the semblance of a contest.

With the death of George Holden Tinkham passed a rugged and patriotic American who had but one purpose in his national service and that was to serve his beloved Boston, the State of Massachusetts, and the United States to the best of his ability. The country can ill afford to lose men of the character of George Holden Tinkham.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I knew George Tinkham during all the years he was a Member of the Congress. He was popular with all the Members of the House. He served well. His relatives have my deep sympathy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the late George Holden Tinkham who served

in this body for 28 years was one of the most colorful men who ever served in the Congress of the United States. He represented the old 10th District of Massachusetts. His district and my district joined each other.

George Tinkham was truly loved by the people of his district. The best evidence of this is the fact that he was elected as a Republican term after term in what was for any other Republican a fairly safe Democratic district.

While I differed with George Tinkham on some matters, I never for a moment, no matter how strong the point of contention, lost one iota of the respect in which I always regarded him, nor any part of the affection which deep down I had for this most unusual and individualistic American. For it was in his individualism that he was outstanding and fulfilled one of the great legends of the American character. There was in George Holden Tinkham an independence, a spirited American sense of individuality, which set him apart. It made him a superb ambassador of good will for America in his numerous travels to practically every part of the earth. Wherever he went he took with him and radiated a joy in life, a sense of well-being, a quality of fight and of victory, that were contagious and charged a room, a hotel lobby, an auditorium, this House, with the zest of a good and a sincere man interested in the problems of his time.

When he fought, which was often, he fought hard, but without malice. His vigorous contempt for hypocrisy might stir rancor in others. He never returned rancor though his language was often penetrating. His individualism and the orthodox consistency of his views persuaded him to a philosophy that revealed the rugged drive for self-reliance and freedom that invested his thinking. George Holden Tinkham was born, we must remember, in the Boston of 1870, only 5 years after the Civil War and won his first election to this House in 1915. He supported magnificently the background from which he sprang and the climate of opinion in which he was bred and to which he belonged. He gave himself fully to the heart of the era in which he served in this House from 1915 until 1943—28 years. When he died at the age of 85 on August 25, 1956, full of years and honor, he left a void in the hearts of the people who had known and respected him. They loved him and, like myself, shall forever miss the voice and the vigor, the amiability and the wit and intelligence of this rare gentleman.

A far greater tribute than I could pay him here was accorded Congressman Tinkham by his own fiercely devoted constituency in the old 10th Massachusetts Congressional District. It is the sort of tribute that makes his political career the envy of his colleagues. For George Holden Tinkham had been tested by the people who elected him. Consequently they did not require him to go through the arduous mills of campaigning once he had established himself in their hearts. They loved and respected George Holden Tinkham as a friend, a legislator, a big-game hunter, a world

traveler, and as an individualist, as well as for his charitable heart. It was not George Holden Tinkham's constituency that retired him from public life, it was Congressman Tinkham who retired on his own accord, and he was succeeded by Christian A. Herter, now Under Secretary of State.

A Mayflower descendant and graduate of Harvard and Harvard Law School, the Tinkham personality explained, if anything can, the indomitable spirit and the passion for freedom that brought to such eventful fruition the extraordinary voyage of a small group of men, women, and children seeking—as Pilgrims—the right in 1620 to worship God in their own way. Consider what that has meant down through the centuries for mankind. He served in the old Boston Common Council even before he was admitted to the Massachusetts bar in 1899. Later, in 1901 and 1902, he served as a member of the board of aldermen and was a Massachusetts State senator from 1910 to 1912. He served in this House from the 64th Congress through the 77th.

George Tinkham was a symbol of democracy. Above all, he was, as an American, as a Representative of his district and as a man, one whom it was an honor to know and to associate with in the affairs of government.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the late George Holden Tinkham, who represented the 10th Massachusetts District from 1915 until 1943, was a man to remember.

His talents were many, and his independence of judgment was admired by friend and foe alike.

This hardy New England characteristic stood him in good stead through all the changing conditions of his long and constructive career as a Member of this House.

By his painstaking attention to the needs of his constituents, and by his numberless personal philanthropies, he won the affection of Republicans and Democrats alike. His seat was assured as long as he wanted it.

His political philosophy was Republican, but the regard in which he was held dissolved all petty partisan differences.

George Holden Tinkham was an original. There will never be a carbon copy of his unique personality, as fresh and clean as the sea breeze that comes off the Atlantic into his beloved Boston, whispering to men of freedom, adventure, and new horizons to be discovered.

Sure of himself, and the affectionate support of his cosmopolitan district, he could go big-game hunting in Africa during congressional elections.

This, unprecedented in itself, sums up his character and his popularity.

Massachusetts is proud of the contributions made by him to our national life.

We pay tribute to his memory today in the confident hope that his example, and those of courageous men like him, will nourish the traditions that future generations will emulate.

As long as our Nation continues to produce men of his quality, the United States will lead the way toward greater fulfillment in freedom for all mankind.

To the memory of George Holden Tinkham, our everlasting respect and admiration.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of an old friend and former colleague in this House who died last autumn at just about the 86th milestone.

George Holden Tinkham had an extraordinary career. He devoted the useful years of his entire life to public service. For many years he was an institution in the public life of Massachusetts.

Having trained himself, as he told me on several occasions, in the hope of a career as a professor, he was destined to serve for 2 years on the Common Council of Boston, for 3 years on the Board of Aldermen in Boston, for 2 years in the Massachusetts Senate, and for 28 years as a Member of Congress—a total of 35 years. He was never defeated.

A Republican in a strong Democratic district, he nevertheless was elected to Congress again and again with large majorities. So strongly did he establish himself in the minds and hearts of his people that for many years he was re-elected without even appearing in his district during the campaign.

I well remember the campaign of 1928 during which for the most part he was in Africa while Governor Smith was running for the Presidency as the "Happy Warrior." A postal card was distributed by his office with his photograph and the caption, "Don't Forget That Other Happy Warrior, George Holden Tinkham." Both "Happy Warriors" carried the district by over 15,000 votes.

George Tinkham was one of the most well read Members of the Congress. He had always been a student of history, of government, of economics, of finance.

He was one of the most traveled Members of the Congress. For many years, and almost to the date of his death, he visited the principal countries of the world and was known to their leaders in both public and private life.

The record in *Who's Who* indicates that he was the first American to fire a shot against the Austrians after America's declaration of war in World War I, at Carpo d'Arbine, on the Piave River, and that he was offered and declined a decoration—the Chevalier Della Corona d'Italia—by the Italian Government.

His apartment in Washington at the Arlington Hotel, where he lived for 28 years, even after the hotel was converted into an office building by reason of a clause in his lease permitting him to remain as long as he was a Member of Congress, was filled with trophies of his hunting expeditions and objects of art gathered in far corners of the world, some of which are today in the Boston Art Museum.

During his service in the Congress he devoted himself at first to the work of the Appropriations Committee and in later years to that of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He always had convictions and the courage of his convictions. He always stood and fought for what he believed to be the fundamentals of Americanism.

Retiring at the age of 72, he left thousands in his district who would always be grateful to him for the counsel and advice, for the helping hand which he had been able to give them as their Congressman.

Those who served with him here will always remember him.

He was a close friend. I served with him in this House for 15 years. I saw him often after his retirement.

I valued his friendship. I shall always recall him with affection, remembering his fearless service to his district, State, and Nation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in tribute to George Holden Tinkham. I served with him years ago on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He was a deep student of world affairs and always a courtly gentleman. He was fearless in his advocacy of the principles he held. He will long be remembered for his service in Congress.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened to learn sometime ago of the passing of a former very distinguished Member of this body, Congressman George Holden Tinkham, who represented the 10th Massachusetts District for many years.

George Tinkham was a close friend of mine. He was one of the first men I met when I came to Washington years ago, when I was in college, to work on the other side of the Capitol during my summer vacations.

Throughout the years, I kept in touch with him, and saw him from time to time up to the time of his death. Of course, I held him in highest regard and esteem as everyone did who knew him. I had a real affection for him.

He was an able, devoted, and faithful public servant. More than that, he was a Bunker Hill American, and he had the courage to express and stand by his convictions for America.

George Tinkham was a keen student of government and economics and many other subjects. Possessed of splendid training and an alert, inquiring mind, he spent a great deal of time studying governmental and financial reports. His forecast of financial and economic trends were always most interesting and accurate.

His political success was sensational; his personality and makeup unique. For years, he was returned to Congress from a district that time and time again gave him overwhelming majorities on some occasions when he was in remote parts of the world following his hobby of big-game hunting.

As a result of his exploits in Africa, Asia, and other parts of the world he collected a large and very interesting exhibit of animals and reptiles, which were mounted in his apartment in the old Arlington Hotel in the Capital. The rare exhibits were set up against a dark background with real theatrical, dramatic skill.

When showing these exhibits to his friends he seldom turned on the apartment lights, but would personally escort his guests from one room and one exhibit to another, guiding the way with a large flashlight. There were many striking exhibits in his collection, but I

always thought that the most impressive, to me at least, was the one that he had brought from India of the cobra and the mongoose. The Congressman captured the deadly cobra and the mongoose by himself in the Indian hinterlands and had them mounted in one piece in a simulated death battle.

He might seem to some to be extraordinary in appearance. He affected a Vandike beard of the kind that General Grant wore. His black hats were invariably jauntily worn. In the winter, he wore an old-fashioned reefer, or pea coat, rather than a full-length overcoat, which came to a point just below his hips. This costume accentuated his rather short, robust stature.

He was a world traveler, linguist, and keen student of foreign policy and problems of other nations. In his own philosophy, he was a strong nationalist, rather surprising for a Harvard-bred scion of an aristocratic Boston family.

In his creed, America was predominant and paramount. He had no time for internationalism or other isms and was an implacable foe of communism. His great success in politics was attributable to his forthright, courageous attitude on foreign policy and current domestic issues and his faithful service to his entire constituency.

He was an able statesman, given to meticulous study of governmental problems and well versed in many fields of learning. He enjoyed a long, useful life and lived to a ripe old age.

George Tinkham will be mourned and missed by a great many people who knew and admired him. His outstanding service in the Congress will long be remembered. His sparkling, unusual, engaging personality, his ready wit, his good company, and his friendly spirit have left an indelible imprint upon his friends and upon the Congress and the time in which he lived.

He will be long remembered as a man of character and intestinal fortitude and devotion to his country. In the company of other Massachusetts colleagues, I attended the most impressive funeral services which were conducted for him in a historic church in his home city of Boston.

Like the many present, I was anxious to pay my last tribute to a good friend whom I had known for many years and who during his lifetime had given me so many reasons to marvel at his alert, informed, and penetrating mind, versatility, his patriotism and his loyalty to those things which are essential to uphold the Nation and its free institutions.

Few, if any, more unusual men have ever trod the Halls of Congress than George Tinkham. His valuable service will have a place in our history; his kindly, generous nature a place in our memory.

To his family, I tender again my most heartfelt sympathy in their sorrowful bereavement. May he find in his eternal reward peace and rest.

MANPOWER UTILIZATION AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recommend strongly the approval of House Resolution 139 authorizing continuance of studies and investigations to improve manpower utilization and personnel management. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has from its inception had the responsibility for reviewing manpower utilization in the Federal Government. Until the 83d Congress the effort consisted mainly of special studies. At that time a more extensive program was launched. It was largely confined to the military departments.

With the experience thus gained, we undertook in the 84th Congress a full-fledged drive to improve manpower management throughout the executive branch. Our approach was based on several proven fundamentals. First, this was to be a cooperative effort between the executive and legislative branches. Second, we wanted every department and agency to establish an active manpower program. Third, we needed top-level support and recognition of the need for manpower planning, and fourth, the results were to be a general reduction in manpower to be achieved through the use of attrition instead of firings.

We have accomplished some of our objectives. We have been receiving some cooperation from the executive branch. Manpower programs have been established throughout the Government and the President has expressed his interest in the need for economical use of manpower. We have not achieved a general reduction. We have, however, had many reports on economies and the expansion in employment has definitely been slowed. Today we are in an excellent position to produce further substantial savings and other beneficial results.

The results to date were not achieved by just sitting back and asking for cooperation. We requested each department and agency to appoint a liaison officer. We held meetings with them and seminars on manpower utilization to acquaint the departments with our objectives.

Every department was requested to select a function for special study. The Canal Zone Government reported that through its functional surveys it was able to eliminate over 1,000 positions despite an increase in workload. The Veterans' Administration surveyed its vocational rehabilitation and training function. They were able to eliminate 450 jobs—14 percent—in the face of an increase of veterans being trained.

We had departments and agencies ask each supervisor down the line to see if he could do with one less employee. The Commerce Department, through this single step, saved 133 positions involving salaries of over \$500,000.

Each department and agency was requested to review every vacant job for essentiality. In Washington alone over 400 jobs were abolished in 2 months. That does not sound like much but the

annual payroll of those jobs was \$2 million. The Air Force completed a similar review and reported 5,711 jobs abolished at a saving to the taxpayer of \$25 million annually. When you add all the results, big and little, it means that 35,000 fewer persons were hired than had been planned. When you couple this with similar reductions in overhead type military positions the total annual savings exceed half a billion dollars.

Our drive to reduce the pressures that are inflating the demands for engineers and scientists is also producing results. The Secretary of Defense has ordered the establishment of quantitative standards for allowable costs under defense contracts. These will not only help cut contract costs but also will eliminate undue competition by placing all contract holders on a footing based on normal business practices. We have already had expressions of appreciation from sources in and out of Government for our work in this regard.

At the same time we have encouraged a drive to improve the use of engineers and to reduce hoarding. This was based on the numerous complaints about hoarding of engineers by holders of defense contracts. We have no proof of this hoarding but reports submitted by the Navy Department showed defense contractors employed 11,700 engineers per billion dollars of total business, whereas the firms with essentially commercial business employed only 3,600 engineers per billion dollars. These figures certainly point to the need for thorough investigation. Hoarding not only means a waste of tax dollars but also of manpower reportedly in critically short supply. I am pleased to be able to report that action has also been initiated by Secretary Wilson to correct this situation.

We held 3 sets of hearings on manpower with 22 appearances by the departments and agencies.

Three special studies and 11 staff visits to field offices and installations were made. Each of these involved recommendations and changes that produced economies.

In addition to the 3 transcripts of hearings, 2 committee reports on manpower utilization and a special survey report were printed. All have received wide distribution based on demands from both Government and industry.

The signing of Public Law 801, which I introduced in the 84th Congress, marked a further step in the drive for good manpower utilization. For the first time the estimated dollars and manpower costs must accompany a new proposal involving expenditures of over a million dollars. This law will give each committee an opportunity to review costs prior to the passage of enabling legislation. This will help relieve some of the burden of achieving economies now borne by the Appropriations Committees.

From the above it can be seen that good manpower utilization is not something that merely happens. It has to be encouraged and when necessary demanded by the Congress. It takes the continuing cooperative support of both the executive and legislative branches.

The end result is of benefit to the taxpayer and to the Federal service. A recent newspaper article pointed out that realization is spreading that our program is resulting in more job security for the Federal civil servant. This is true because it is based on manpower planning that considers the long-range welfare of the individual and the agency instead of indiscriminate hirings and firings to meet the immediate needs of the employer alone.

Again, I wish to add my strong support for favorable consideration of House Resolution 139. I am sure that the results obtained will be a sound basis for future accomplishments.

HON. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD, POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, by statute, the Postmaster General is the only Cabinet officer whose reappointment requires Senate confirmation. Yesterday, the Senate formally confirmed the nomination of Arthur E. Summerfield, of Flint, Mich., for a second 4-year term as Postmaster General.

Because Mr. Summerfield is a resident of my district, this action was a great satisfaction to me. I know him to be the finest kind of gentleman and a devoted public servant. The high praise which Mr. Summerfield received, from members of both political parties in the Senate yesterday, is a tribute to his administrative achievements in this office.

Mr. Summerfield brought to the Office of Postmaster General essentially the same talent and methods by which he achieved success in the business world; a constant effort to give efficient service to the public; an unending search for new and better methods; and the creation of a flexible, responsive organization.

I am proud to salute and congratulate Mr. Summerfield on this occasion.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on page 49 of the President's Economic Report the President recommends an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code designed to improve the ability of local and State governments to finance their projects. I know most Congressmen are aware of the difficulties local school boards, sewer districts, and other taxing authorities are faced in going ahead with their various construction projects for which bonds have already been voted. Everything is ready except the money is not there.

I quote the pertinent excerpt from the President's Economic Report:

Some improvement in the ability of these governmental units to finance their projects would result from an amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to extend the "conduit principle" to regulated investment companies that hold their assets in State and local securities. The amendment, which would involve no loss of revenue, would permit regulated investment companies of this type to pass through to their stockholders the tax-exempt status of the income received on State and local securities. The Congress is requested to enact legislation to accomplish this result.

The reason this would involve no loss of revenue is because presently the investment trusts will not invest in municipal bonds because they do not get the benefit of the tax exemption for their shareholders. To those interested in the little investor, it might be well to point out that it is through the device of the investment trust that the small investor can gain the spread in portfolio that the big investor has. So, in effect, this proposed amendment would be giving the small investor the same advantage that the large investor presently has.

Our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], has anticipated the President's request for legislation in this area by introducing on January 3, 1957, H. R. 1222, which will accomplish this purpose. I have introduced an identical bill today to indicate my personal support of this recommendation and to emphasize the importance of it.

STANDARD OIL OF CALIFORNIA ADMITS INFLUENCING ITS DEALERS TO OPPOSE H. R. 11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, I described the organization and the workings of a new lobby of the major oil companies, the purpose of which is to have the oil jobbers and retail gasoline dealers wire and write Members of Congress in opposition to H. R. 11.

On January 31, Standard of California released a statement from its San Francisco office, in answer to my statement of the 28th. This statement contains an unmistakable admission that the company has in fact been inspiring its customers to wire Members of Congress to oppose H. R. 11.

Having been caught redhanded, as it were, the company now becomes indignant and declares that:

We believe our company has acted entirely within its rights in carrying to our dealers a program of information to point out to them the damaging effects this bad piece of legislation would have on their business and the oil business in general.

And this company further says:

We believe we not only have a right to express this opinion, but a duty to do so.

On February 1, the Washington representative of Standard of California sent me a copy of this statement, requesting that I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Standard requests this,

its letter says, "in the interest of fair play."

IS IT FAIR PLAY TO MISLEAD MEMBERS OF CONGRESS?

Now let us examine the basis for this demand for fair play.

First, Standard argues that it has a right to express its opinion. With this I would agree. The question is, however, why has this company not come out in the open before now and expressed its opposition to H. R. 11, instead of working behind the scenes to have its customers do this. Certainly this silence on its own behalf could not be because Standard is unable to get top-level attention paid to its views. As I have said before, the major oil companies have been able to win great favors from the Federal Government, and they have been able to get consideration of their interests, both at home and abroad.

Where, during the past month, has a major oil company sent wires or letters to Members of Congress opposing the bill in its own name? Why, in short, have they preferred to give us the "false-front" lobby?

The answer is to be found, not in the oil companies' spirit of fair play, but in the very point of H. R. 11. This bill says certain things about how a supplier may and may not treat its customers. Therefore, if the bill does anything it must either help the supplier or help the supplier's customers. Standard of California has preferred to have Members of Congress believe that the bill would hurt its customers, and it has tried to make its customers believe that. What kind of "fair play" is this?

The new statement which Standard of California wishes me to place in the *RECORD* also says that its representatives have not pressured dealers to send wires opposing H. R. 11. Admittedly, however, this company has not hesitated to try to pressure and mislead Members of Congress, by inspiring a flood of wires which would have the Members think that H. R. 11 would hurt the jobbers and retail gasoline dealers. What kind of fair play shall we call that?

IS IT FAIR PLAY TO MISLEAD CUSTOMERS?

Finally, this new statement of Standard of California continues the same old propaganda line that the company has been giving its dealers. It claims that H. R. 11 would prevent the company from "assisting our dealers to meet competition." Since this is obviously not true, by what standards of fair play can the company demand that we lend our limited and feeble means of publicity to such a statement?

The simple fact is that H. R. 11 will not prevent Standard from meeting the price of an off-brand seller, or from meeting the price of any competitor's gasoline. Nor will the bill prevent Standard from discriminating in price to assist its dealers in meeting any competition that may be generated by a competing brand of gasoline. What the bill would do, however, is to require Standard to assist its dealers to meet the competition that is generated by Standard itself.

During the past 2 years the House Small Business Committee has heard

testimony from a great number of retail gasoline dealers from all parts of the country. Many of these were still in business when they testified. Many others had already been put out of business by their supplier's practice of discriminating in prices as between its dealers. These people have uniformly complained about one major oil company or another, complaining that the company discriminates by charging some of its dealers high prices while granting other competing dealers low prices. These dealers and ex-dealers have, furthermore, uniformly asked for passage of H. R. 11. The bill is designed specifically to eliminate the kind of discriminations they are complaining about.

IS IT FAIR PLAY TO DESTROY CUSTOMERS?

Now what is this conflict about and what will H. R. 11 do? Let us say that there are 4 filling stations at a given intersection. Three of these are Standard dealers and one is a dealer who sells an off-brand gasoline at 2 cents less than Standard's regular retail price.

Now the discrimination is made when Standard reduces its price to one of its dealers at the intersection, but not to its other two dealers. The understanding is of course that the dealer who receives the lower price will reduce his price to consumers—or there need not be a spoken understanding, the dealer will do it anyway. The result is of course that the low consumer price offered by this favored dealer will divert trade from the off-brand dealer. But an equal result will be that Standard's favored dealer will also divert trade from the other two Standard dealers who are not given a price by which they can meet the competition.

True, the eventual result is likely to be that the off-brand dealer will go out of business, as will the small refiner who supplies him, and then Standard's price to the favored dealer will be raised again. But in the meantime, Standard's other two dealers will most likely go out of business too. Sample studies which have been submitted to the Small Business Committee indicate that about one-third of the retail gasoline dealers go out of business each year, only to be replaced by other young men who hopefully scrape together a few thousand dollars to invest in this business.

Standard of California now professes great concern and tenderness for its jobbers and dealers. Reading the company's statement one would gain the impression that its greatest wish is to assist its jobbers and dealers in meeting competition. But if this were true, why, then, when Standard assists one dealer to meet competition does it not assist all of its other dealers who are in actual competition with that dealer? The oil companies are free to do that now. And if they did it, there would perhaps be no need for H. R. 11, insofar as the gasoline business is concerned. There would be no need for a law to require the oil companies to do what they say they wish to do. But there is a need, and this is what H. R. 11 does: It tells the supplier to give equal treatment to all of its dealers who are in competition in and among

themselves. Or, more precisely, it tells the supplier not to give his dealers such unequal treatment that he causes a "substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to create monopoly." There are exceptions of course. For example, if the supplier has cost differences in serving the different dealers, these differences may be reflected in his prices.

If we judge by the actions of most of the major oil companies, rather than by their words, I think we would have to say that the company does not wish to assist its dealers to meet their competition, but to crush its own competition in a way which involves the smallest possible reduction in the corporation's profits. Indeed, we would have to say that these great oil corporations even discriminate among their dealers when there is no competition to be crushed, merely to squeeze their dealers' margins, so that the oil companies will themselves take a maximum portion of the profit contained in the price they prescribe for consumers.

Do these practices constitute fair play?

WHAT ARE THE POWER RELATIONSHIPS?

Let us consider briefly how the economic power of the top oil companies compares with that of the independent jobbers and dealers, and then ask the question again.

Standard Oil of California has assets of about \$2 billion. Its profits in the year 1955, came to \$231 million, after taxes. No doubt they were much higher last year. It is one of the 6 largest oil companies, which together have assets of more than \$18 billion and had profits last year of about \$2 billion, after paying taxes and paying all advertising and lobbying expenses.

Each of these six companies owns industrial empires which far exceed the wealth of most of the individual nations of the world. They have had tremendous financial and other assistance from the Federal Government, in not only maintaining but extending their holdings of both production fields and markets on all the continents of the globe. Directly or indirectly they have had the assistance of the Federal Government, not only in maintaining but in extending the cartel by which their prices are fixed and their markets are protected.

These and other major oil companies have long since bought up most of the jobber-distributor plants, most of the filling stations, and most of the good filling station sites in the United States.

As for the independent jobbers who once distributed gasoline, these have been largely replaced by the oil companies' own distributing systems, and are becoming more so. In some instances a substantial jobber is allowed to duplicate, to an extent, the services of the oil company's distribution system, but only where the gasoline of some small refiner remains accessible to such a jobber. For the most part, the independent jobber still exists only in areas where markets are thin and he must send his trucks over back roads to make small deliveries, or in urban markets where there is fringe business of a type which the oil companies do not care to handle. As an in-

dependent jobber in New York wrote me on January 22:

I have the undesired business that the major oil companies do not care for . . . I pick up my oil from the major oil companies and deliver it to my bulk plant and sell these many peddlers in their 300 gallon, 500 gallon and larger tank trucks. They in turn sell this oil to people in the underprivileged slums who cannot buy more than 5 gallons at a time.

Incidentally, this jobber adds:

Unfortunately I do not have much respect for the major companies as they treat most jobbers worse than a sharecropper.

As for the retail filling stations however, the trend has been somewhat different. The oil companies lease these stations, for the most part, to independent operators, for the simple reason that it is cheaper than paying wages. Young men, always hopeful that they can establish a small business of their own, save or borrow a few thousand dollars to invest in one of these leased stations, and then work 12, 14, or perhaps 16 hours a day trying to hang onto their investment. Here, then, is the important question: Are these young men being accorded fair play when the supplier with whom they have teamed up in good faith, and with whom they have made an investment, squeezes them out by discriminating in prices among them?

IS ABUSE OF POWER THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF THE AMERICAN BUSINESS SYSTEM?

Standard Oil of California now says in its statement to me that H. R. 11 is "wholly contrary to the basic principles of the American business system." If this be true—if the American business system allows wanton abuse of power to crush a small competitor and allows the great corporate combines to destroy willy-nilly the customers who have tied their economic destinies to these combines in good faith—then the system is immoral and should be modified.

In asking for H. R. 11, small-business people are asking only for something approaching the golden rule, in business. What they ask for is modest and reasonable. They should have it and have it without delay.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT GASOLINE DEALERS SUPPORTS H. R. 11

I received yesterday a telegram from the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers which reads in part as follows:

In order to correct any false impression that may have been gained we wish to advise that the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers is the only national association representing the retail segment of the petroleum industry and has membership in 36 States from coast to coast. NCPR, speaking for approximately 200,000 independent service station operators across the Nation, strongly supports the equality of opportunity bill and strongly urges its prompt adoption by the Congress.

No practice has done so much to destroy free enterprise in the retail petroleum industry as price discrimination.

The injury to small business in general and to the Nation's service station operators in particular caused by the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil-Detroit case will continue to deepen and worsen until Congress acts to remedy this situation. We

earnestly request the help of Congress to secure the adoption of this desperately-needed legislation as early as possible in the present session.

JOHN W. NERLINGER, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT DEALERS
SUPPORTS H. R. 11

I also have a letter dated January 30, from Texas Service Stations, Associated, which reads in part as follows:

Events of the past few months have confirmed our need for adoption of this bill in the present session where it has been reintroduced with the same number, H. R. 11 and S. 11. Destructive price discrimination has been on the rise in our industry and it is one of the principal factors causing an estimated 60,000 service station operators to fail in business, quit or be forced out of business each year.

We make this request in our members' behalf because service station operators are victims of price discrimination which destroys our businesses and savings, and we also make this request in the interest of preserving small business' opportunity in America and in the interest of consumers who are gouged by monopoly price fixing after small business is destroyed.

I insert in the RECORD the letter to me from the representative of Standard Oil of California, together with this company's statement of January 31.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 1, 1957.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: We are attaching a copy of a statement made on January 31 by Standard Oil Company of California concerning allegations and statements made by you to the Congress on January 23, 1957, with regard to H. R. 11.

In the interest of fair play, we request that you have this statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,

WOOLLEN H. WALSHIE,
Washington Representative, Standard Oil Company of California.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., January 31, 1957.—The Standard Oil Company of California today made the following statement concerning certain allegations and statements made in Congress with regard to H. R. 11:

"We believe our company has acted entirely within its rights in carrying to our dealers a program of information to point out to them the damaging effects this bad piece of legislation would have on their business and the oil business in general.

"It is completely against this company's policies to make any attempt at all to 'pressure' its dealers and all our representatives in the field have long-standing instructions to this effect.

"Our inquiry indicates that the initial communication against the bill, made by the dealer mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was entirely voluntary and that the pressure on this dealer, if any, was from the other side. Of the hundreds who sent communications in opposition, it is not strange that a few could have been induced to change their minds.

"We have no intention of accepting without a word of protest legislative proposals that will harm our business and harm the dealers who sell our products. We have talked in opposition to H. R. 11 not only to our service station dealers, but to every other group that might be interested.

"Passage of this legislation would prohibit us as a supplier from meeting local competition and from assisting our dealers in doing so. We do not believe that either

we or our dealers can operate unless allowed to be freely competitive. This bill would artificially restrict competition and it is wholly contrary to the basic principles of the American business system. We believe we not only have a right to express this opinion, but a duty to do so."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GARY for the balance of the day (Tuesday) and Wednesday on account of official business.

To Mr. KITCHIN for Wednesday and Thursday, February 6 and 7, 1957, on account of the necessity of being out of the District of Columbia on official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) today for 30 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri for 10 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HULL and to include an address by Senator SYMINGTON.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. JENSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUDGE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BALDWIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BERRY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT to include a telegram in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 607. An act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.), the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 6, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

430. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

431. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to transfer to the Government of the District of Columbia the Public Employment Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

432. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report (pt. I) of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction over Federal Areas Within the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

433. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the General Services Administration, and Federal probation officers within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

434. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year 1956, pursuant to the act approved June 23, 1934, (18 U. S. C. 4127); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

435. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

436. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

437. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 3, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Baltimore Harbor and channels, Maryland, requested by resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted August 17, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 27. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 147. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2367, a bill to

establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4353. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 4354. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4355. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall make certain payments to the counties of Mecklenburg, Halifax, and Charlotte, State of Virginia, from the proceeds of sales of timber located on that portion of the land within the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va., and N. C., situated in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4356. A bill to amend section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that policies of insurance issued under that section on the 5-year level premium term plan may be exchanged for or converted to insurance on any other plan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4357. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products so as to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of unsound, unhealthful, diseased, unwholesome, or adulterated poultry or poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4358. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to authorize sales on credit; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 4359. A bill to make permanent certain temporary judgeships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4360. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 4361. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4362. A bill to amend section 334 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to increased allotments for durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 4363. A bill to provide for carryback and carryover of foreign tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 4364. A bill to create a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 4365. A bill to provide free barber services to all Armed Forces personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4366. A bill to amend the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4367. A bill to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4368. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide travel and transportation allowances to enlisted members of the uniformed services for their first leave; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4369. A bill to amend the act of May 17, 1910, with respect to the composition and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 4370. A bill to amend section 645 of title 14, United States Code, relative to the settlement of claims incident to activities of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4371. A bill to create the office of Guest Member in the Senate and in the House of Representatives of the United States for former Presidents of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 4372. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4373. A bill to authorize the preservation of the United States ship *Olympia* and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4374. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and reenact the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4375. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 4376. A bill to establish the United States Domestic Public Works Bank, which shall purchase obligations of certain local governmental bodies where such obligations cannot be sold on the open market except at an interest rate in excess of 3 percent per annum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COAD:

H. R. 4377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that payments received by an individual in any taxable year under the Soil Bank Act may, at the election of such individual, be included in his gross income for the following taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 4378. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the active duty obligation of certain officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 4379. A bill to authorize construction of Saylorville Reservoir on the Des Moines River, Iowa, for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 4380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income-tax treatment of dividends paid by regulated investment companies which hold the bulk of their assets in State and local securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4381. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to furnish memorial markers commemorating certain deceased members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4382. A bill to authorize the performance of active duty for training of 11 weeks in each of 2 consecutive years for certain persons enlisted under the provisions of section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 4383. A bill to amend the act of July 27, 1956, relating to detention of mail for temporary periods in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRANAHAH:

H. R. 4384. A bill to provide overtime pay for substitute postal employees and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4385. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 4386. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4387. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4388. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4389. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide certain retirement benefits for certain employees connected with the operation and testing of aircraft; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4390. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of documents evidencing the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of motor vehicles sold to or owned by certain carriers subject to such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4391. A bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to require freight forwarders to obtain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4392. A bill to amend section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide more definite standards for determining who is entitled to exemption from part IV of that act as an association of shippers or a shipper's agent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4393. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 4394. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas," approved August 28, 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4395. A bill to reduce the percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4396. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public private educational institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4397. A bill to provide a more equitable method for computing the self-employment income of farmers under the Social Security Act for taxable years ending during the period commencing January 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4398. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4399. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 4400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the taxes imposed on the transportation of persons and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 4401. A bill to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4402. A bill to provide parking space for the automobiles of patrons and postal employees at postal installations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4403. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H. R. 4404. A bill to amend section 15 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to make loans insured by the Secretary of Agriculture eligible for investment by national banks as "investment securities" rather than loan obligations, and to include such loans in the excepted class of investments listed in section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, relating to national banking associations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4405. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that all cabs for hire in the District of Columbia be compelled to carry insurance for the protection of passengers, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4406. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 4407. A bill to amend the law relating to residence of assistant assessors for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4408. A bill to provide five longevity increases for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force who have completed 28 years of service, without regard to the grade in which such service was rendered; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 4409. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (by request):

H. R. 4410. A bill to suspend and to modify the application of the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to lands in the East Bench unit of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4411. A bill to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4412. A bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4413. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat or other grain producers from liability under the act where all the wheat or other grain crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 4414. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1948, to authorize the erection of appropriate Government headstones or markers in cemetery plots in memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died while serving in the overseas theaters of operations and whose bodies have not been recovered or identified or have been buried at sea; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 4415. A bill to reorganize the civil defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 4416. A bill to provide funds to pay nationals of the United States who have war damage claims against Germany and Japan, without additional direct appropriations therefor, and to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4417. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$700 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4418. A bill to reorganize the civil defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4419. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4420. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 4421. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with the Bard Irrigation District of California with respect to operation and maintenance of works on the reservation division, Yuma reclamation project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4422. A bill to restrict the right of minors to cross the border into Mexico in the vicinity of Mexicali where not done for a bona fide purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4423. A bill to create additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to amounts paid for admission to certain classical ballet

performances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4425. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4426. A bill to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 to provide insurance against earthquake damage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 4427. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 4428. A bill to provide increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to liberalize the requirements for awarding additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4429. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4430. A bill to authorize the improvement of Hull Creek, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4431. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for the safety of chemicals in cosmetics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4432. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for the safety of chemical additives in food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 4433. A bill to provide benefits established by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to persons who graduated from Air Force ROTC training in 1954 and served on active duty for training in the Air National Guard before February 1, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 4434. A bill to provide a 1 year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4435. A bill to increase the rate of pension of certain widows of World War I veterans and the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to widows and children of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4436. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide that certain additional categories of loans to veterans may be automatically guaranteed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 4437. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 4438. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4439. A bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 4440. A bill to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income-tax purposes not to exceed \$100 each year of political contributions made to candidates for elective

Federal offices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4441. A bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 4442. A bill to facilitate the transfer of storage facilities between the military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4443. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4444. A bill to amend section 602 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus property under the control of executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution to provide that members of the National Guard shall not be called or ordered to perform active duty for training without their consent for periods in excess of 15 days, except for an initial period of active duty for training of not more than 8 weeks; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of an annual United States Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. J. Res. 224. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the official founding and launching of the conservation movement for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution extending the best wishes of the Government and people of the United States to Blackburn College, in Carlinville, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 148. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of existing and potential defense coordination of the inland water transport facilities and resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 149. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURLISON:

H. Res. 150. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 151. Resolution granting 1 year's salary to the estate of Edward Joseph Marshall, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 152. Resolution providing for expenses of investigations authorized pursuant to House Resolution 99; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. Res. 153. Resolution concerning payment of claims by the United States for damage resulting from sonic blasts and aircraft accidents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 154. Resolution authorizing the creation of a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. Res. 155. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the Congress of the United States to repeal and abolish the tax on interstate transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the Congress to use its influence to abrogate the present political division of Ireland, and to protest the presence of British troops in Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the Congress to provide legislation giving grants-in-aid for school building purposes to school districts in the various States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial by the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to offering congratulations to the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower and the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON as they embark on their second terms and continue to assume their positions of responsibility and leadership and praying that this administration may be characterized by world peace and security; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the Congress to provide a stopgap legislation extending the period of time in which Public Law 587, 83d Congress is to become effective, relative to the termination of the Klamath Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4445. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mr. Shirley B. Stebbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 4446. A bill for the relief of Curtis W. Strong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 4447. A bill for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Co., of La., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 4448. A bill to renew and extend the term of patent No. 600,890 for an additional term of 17 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4449. A bill to renew and extend the term of patent No. 887,848 for an additional term of 17 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 4450. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hans Zimmerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 4451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret W. Morgan McCracken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 4452. A bill for the relief of Matteo Petrillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 4453. A bill for the relief of Robert Cyril Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4454. A bill for the relief of Eleftherios Loukas Moschos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 4455. A bill for the relief of Maurice Marcel Chavigny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETTELLA:

H. R. 4456. A bill for the relief of Denise Curkan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4457. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Shikany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 4458. A bill for the relief of Bruno Cos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4459. A bill for the relief of Anton Revak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4460. A bill for the relief of Joyce Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4461. A bill for the relief of Johnnie P. Saylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 4462. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacinto Gochoco, Jr., his wife, Felicidad Gochoco, and their minor son, Jacinto Gochoco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sarolta S. Neubauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 4464. A bill for the relief of John M. Dean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4465. A bill for the relief of Linda Bollella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 4466. A bill for the relief of Angela Insana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 4467. A bill for the relief of Diego Moncado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. R. 4468. A bill for the relief of Florencio Doriman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 4469. A bill for the relief of A. W. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 4470. A bill for the relief of Willie H. Tennon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. R. 4471. A bill for the relief of Willi Walther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4472. A bill for the relief of Paulita H. Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 4473. A bill for the relief of Carolina M. Gomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4474. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Aryeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4475. A bill for the relief of Emilio Poglianich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 4476. A bill for the relief of Miss Florence V. Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4477. A bill for the relief of Michael Tony Fenfene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 4478. A bill for the relief of Angelika Veresse Eskildsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 4479. A bill for the relief of Oldrich Bartasek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4480. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Dweek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4481. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leonila E. V. Pretel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 4482. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Riccardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4483. A bill for the relief of Menelaos Spyridon Coulouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 4484. A bill for the relief of Albert Charles Jolly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

76. By Mr. BARING: Petition of Las Vegas Aerie No. 1213, Fraternal Order of Eagles, that the Congress of the United States set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplain's Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

77. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Farmington Hill Grange No. 841, Tloga, Pa., urging the passage of legislation that will make available to the people of Pennsylvania the utmost benefits of the proposed development of electric production facilities at Niagara Falls, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Governor of California Proclaims February 3 Through 9, 1957, as Chamber of Commerce Week—Huntington Park Chamber in Great 23d District Issues Special "Kit" in Recognition of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of California proclaims the week of February 3 through 9 as Chamber of Commerce Week in California. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to you and all the other distinguished Members of this great representative body the following text of a proclamation recently issued by Hon. Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of my native State of California, and attested to by Frank W. Jordan, secretary of state, proclaiming the week of February 3 through 9, 1957, as Cham-

ber of Commerce Week throughout my native State of California:

The first chamber of commerce was established in California in 1851 and was responsible for the initiation of a great service to industry, commerce, and the communities of our State. Today there are 621 independent city chambers throughout the Golden State that are playing an exemplary part in the progress of the communities. Were these chambers to operate individually, there would exist a bottleneck in the duties that they perform. With the organization of the State chamber of commerce, the efforts of all chambers are being steered into a common project.

It is this type of cooperation between the cities that has given California the reputation of being the most progressive State. National industries are recognizing the potentialities of placing their operations in the State; problems between these industries and the communities in which they settle are being ably handled through the local chambers of commerce; local civic leaders are continually called on to aid in guiding the growth of their areas. These civic duties that are being absorbed by the chambers are worthy of our continual recognition.

Therefore, I, Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California, do hereby proclaim the week of February 3 through 9 as Chamber of Commerce Week, and I urge my fellow Californians to become acquainted with the operation of their local chambers and to take an active part in the noteworthy work that they are doing.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of California to be affixed this 19th day of December A. D. 1956.

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Governor of California.

Attest:

FRANK W. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, the proclamation text not only recites some of the early history of the establishment of the chamber of commerce in 1851, but indicates some of the very important work which is accomplished by this important community organization.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to inform you that the chamber of commerce in the important city of Huntington Park, Los Angeles County, in the great 23d Congressional District, wherein my district congressional office is located has, in connection with the activities throughout the State of California, during the week, within its own splendid organization promulgated a strong, local campaign, in which campaign it strongly urges the objectives of the chamber of commerce in the community. In connection with this emphasized effort by the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce, I have received from Roger B. McGinnis, the very able chairman of

public relations committee of the California Chamber of Commerce, he also being the valued secretary-manager of the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce, a "kit of materials, ideas, and suggestions for possible guides and use during Chamber of Commerce Week." The very ably prepared kit includes among other comments and suggestions the following: Names of Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce public relations committee; exhibits, judging, and awards; how to organize and mobilize committee for effective activity during Chamber of Commerce Week; proposed assignments for committee; suggestions for school activities during Chamber of Commerce Week; service-club programs, public forums, membership orientation, open house, and so forth; how can you help your newspaper editor help you during California Chamber of Commerce week; suggested news story; suggested editorial; getting radio coverage; suggested radio spot announcements.

My gracious friend, Roger B. McGinnis, writes me and says:

As you will have noticed, this is the first time in the 106-year history of chamber of commerce in California that we have been honored by this type of recognition.

Mr. Speaker, the kit which I received from the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce secretary also included copy of their splendid monthly Reporter, published monthly by way of reporting to the hundreds of members and including items of general interest. It lists their standing committees such as advertising and publicity, civic affairs, education, industrial, legislation and taxation, merchants' division, Fetchers Club—membership—and parking, and give the name of each chairman and the regular meeting day and place. It is a pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to note that the majority of these committee chairmen are the very busy, successful men of Huntington Park who are taking time to materially aid in constructive citizenship and prosperous, happy communities.

Let the U. N. Be Strong and Fortright in Its Action Toward All Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations once again finds itself in a predicament largely because of its own making.

It has asked Israel to withdraw from the Gaza strip. Israel has refused without firm guarantees.

While we all regret that Israel hasn't seen fit to cooperate with the U. N.—can we really blame them?

They see Russia ignoring U. N. requests and resolutions every time it suits their fancy—the latest in Hungary. They see that the U. N. has not done anything about Russia—so cannot they

logically expect that nothing will be done about the failure of Israel to cooperate.

Of course, sometimes the U. N. takes a firm hand when dealing with weaker nations—but it fails to show any intestinal fortitude when dealing with Russia.

It seems to me that if the U. N. is going to justify its existence it must be firm and treat everyone alike. If it is going to be strong against the weak and weak against the strong then it can serve no useful purpose. It has become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal.

Over the weekend two resolutions with regard to Israel getting out of Egypt were adopted in the U. N. Even their sponsors cannot agree as to what these resolutions mean. They are just so many words—falling far short of the clear-cut decisions called for.

Let the U. N. be strong and forthright in its action toward all nations and it will not be misunderstood.

Statement of John F. Baldwin Before Judiciary Committee in Favor of Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following statement which I made before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives on Monday, February 4, 1957, in support of H. R. 542, of which I am the author, and other similar civil rights bills which have been introduced in the House of Representatives:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee to speak on behalf of H. R. 542 and other similar bills which have been introduced in the House of Representatives. These bills would establish a Federal Commission on Civil Rights, would create an additional Assistant Attorney General's position in the Department of Justice, and would authorize the Attorney General to institute civil actions or applications for a permanent or temporary injunction, or restraining order, in cases involving a violation of civil rights, including the right to vote.

It seems to me that perhaps the most important single right of a citizen of the United States is the right to vote in a Federal election for the offices of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or a Member of the House of Representatives. I believe that this right to vote in a Federal election should be given every protection by the Federal Government. It is deeply disturbing to hear reports that there have been incidents where citizens of the United States have been intimidated or threatened in an effort to prevent them from registering or from voting in a Federal election. If these reports are true, the passage of this civil rights bill is most essential in order to provide proper protection to such citizens.

Many constituents in my congressional district are very much interested in the passage of this civil rights measure. They feel that it is completely proper and just for the Fed-

eral Government to establish more clearly its position in this field of voting rights in Federal elections. I share their views on this subject and would like to urge that this important Judiciary Committee approve this civil rights measure and bring it before the House of Representatives at an early date in the 85th Congress.

Hoover Commission Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced three bills aimed at saving an estimated \$2 billion in unnecessary Government spending.

These bills would put into effect several of the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission. This is an attempt to permit a substantial reduction in expenditures without injuring necessary or desirable activities of the Government.

The Government of the United States is the biggest business enterprise on earth, and Congress has a responsibility to operate it in the most efficient and businesslike manner possible.

These three bills would call for the following action:

First. Warehouse space would be pooled between the armed services. At present, the Army, Navy, and Air Force have maintained separate storage facilities, often partly vacant and sometimes in the same city. My proposal would unify warehousing, making it possible for the various services to interchange excess space.

Surprising as it may seem, the Government maintains depots with a total storage area, which, if spread out in one place, would cover 31,000 acres, or about 50 square miles. According to the Hoover Commission report, it costs the Defense Department almost \$3 billions annually to operate these depots. By making these facilities interchangeable, the Commission believes that much wasted area could be dispensed with.

The Hoover group has estimated that this action could eliminate 172 million square feet of warehousing and result in an annual saving of some \$250 million.

Second. Surplus disposal policies would be tightened. Specifically, my second bill would require an agency of the Government to offer any surplus item first to other services or Government agencies before dumping it on the open market at a sacrifice price.

In addition to this, it would give the General Services Administration wider authority to coordinate surplus disposal and buying operations throughout the Government. There is reason to believe that such centralized direction can result in smaller inventories and tighter inventory controls. As one vivid illustration of overstocking, the Commission has cited the instance of the Army Signal Corps, with an 8½ year supply on hand of dry-cell flashlight batteries, an obviously perishable commodity.

On a given date 2 years ago the Commission found that there was a total value of \$66 billion in property on hand in Government warehouses throughout the country. Much of this property deteriorates or becomes obsolete before it can be issued. Some \$2 billion worth must be disposed of each year to private dealers, at an estimated 5 percent to 7 percent of the original cost.

Sometimes one agency will sell for surplus a commodity which is currently in demand by another agency. The Hoover Commission disclosed one situation in which the Army Transportation Corps had offered to sell \$200,000 worth of marine engines on the open market until the GSA discovered that the Army engineers needed the identical engines and arranged a transfer.

Thus, a saving was twice effected: Once, when the Transportation Corps avoided selling at a sacrifice and again when the engineers avoided the necessity of buying new engines at higher prices.

The Hoover report avers that this type of tightening throughout the Government's surplus program could save close to \$1 billion a year.

Third. Government budgeting and accounting procedures would be reformed. Budgeting would be done on an annual-cost basis, with a big cut in carryover funds.

During the present fiscal year, some \$74 billions in funds were carried over unspent from previous appropriations. This figure, we might note, is more than the total budget being requested for the current year. All of this money was appropriated in earlier years to various arms of the Government. Unspent, it has accumulated to the credit of the various departments. Congress, for all practical purposes, has lost control over this money.

My third bill would establish an annual accrued expenditure basis for appropriations. As of the end of a fiscal year, the excess above the amount actually required and spent during that year by any agency would lapse unless otherwise specifically provided for in the appropriation act.

It seems to me that the reforms embodied in these bills are among the more valuable recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Of course we cannot surrender the legislative prerogative and adopt changes just because some commission recommends them, but these particular proposals, with their attendant benefits in tax savings, certainly seem to merit our most serious consideration.

In the introduction of this legislation, I have had the pleasure of working with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations, Congressman REUSS has devoted much care and considerable study to the recommendations for more efficient management and operation in all the agencies of our Federal Government.

He has introduced similar legislation, including a proposal not unlike mine of last year to enhance efficiency by removing several thousand Federal job-holders from the patronage rolls and placing

them under the competitive merit system of civil service.

To date, Congress has enacted 31 public laws pursuant to the report of the second Commission on Governmental Organization. Some tax savings have surely resulted.

While recognizing that certain other of the latest Hoover recommendations are difficult, if not impossible, of enactment since they involve much deeper policy than mere streamlining and efficiency, I think it behooves us to take a very close look at such avenues as are available to us to bring about a much-needed reduction in the costs of operating the Government whenever this can be done without causing legitimate functions of the Government to suffer.

United States Attorney J. Julius Levy Resigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorials: one from the Scranton Times and the other from the Scranton Tribune and a news story from the Scranton Times on the resignation of Attorney J. Julius Levy, of Scranton, as United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania:

[From the Scranton Times of January 25, 1957]

LEVY QUITS FEDERAL POST

The resignation of Attorney J. Julius Levy as United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania was not entirely unexpected. For the past few months there had been reports that he was preparing to step down from the job which he had filled since August 1953.

It is no secret that Mr. Levy gave up a lucrative private practice to take on the post of Federal prosecutor with its strict ban on all outside professional activity. When he accepted the Government job, it was the hope of many of his friends that the office would prove the steppingstone to an appointment as a Federal judge. No judicial vacancy ever developed in the district during his tenure as Federal attorney, however, and Attorney Levy, in submitting his resignation, now feels that he "cannot continue further in this public service without serious injury to my personal estate and the welfare of my family."

Attorney Levy had achieved a reputation as an outstanding lawyer prior to his acceptance of the Federal post. In the latter position, he has been a diligent, conscientious Government officer. A major assignment which he has carried out has been the direction of the grand jury probe into charges of fraud and corruption in connection with the construction of the Tobyhanna Signal Corps Depot. That inquiry is nearing its end, and Attorney Levy has indicated his willingness to stay on, should his superiors so desire, until it is completed. He will take with him in his return to private practice the best wishes not only of his fellow members of the bar but of his many friends throughout the middle district and the State at large.

[From the Scranton Tribune of January 26 1957]

A SPLENDID PUBLIC SERVANT WITHDRAWS

The resignation of J. Julius Levy as United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania while not coming as a complete surprise nonetheless adds up to a major loss in public service to the Department of Justice.

Mr. Levy has served in the post for about 3½ years and over that period demonstrated a fidelity to duty, a loyalty to his oath, a capacity for earnest endeavor, and untiring effort which has distinguished him throughout his career in the law. In leaving public office to return to private practice, Attorney Levy may do so with the assurance of a task well performed and the sincere appreciation of the public and the Government which he served.

Mr. Levy, like many another able Government servant, is the victim of a penuriosity on the part of our Government in recompensing the men who volunteer to serve it. As he pointed out, he could continue in his post only with serious injury to his personal estate and his family's welfare. The monetary compensation of the office was inadequate for his needs with the result that the position became too expensive for him to retain.

Those familiar with the situation know very well that he continued in office at a major sacrifice in income and under circumstances which placed an enormous demand on his time.

So while it is most regrettable to contemplate his departure from the United States attorney's office, it is quite understandable.

Mr. Levy was especially well qualified for the office he held. In earlier years he was an assistant district attorney for Lackawanna County and was a specially appointed prosecutor in the probe of slot-machine rackets in Scranton some years back. In addition his civil and criminal law practice furnished him with a complete background of jurisprudence.

While regretting his departure we readily extend our commendations for the splendid record he achieved and express the hope that he continue his success in private practice.

[From the Scranton Times of January 25, 1957]

IKE COMMENDS UNITED STATES ATTORNEY— SPLENDID RECORD OF LEVY IS CITED

President Dwight D. Eisenhower has commended United States Attorney J. Julius Levy, whose resignation becomes effective Friday, for the excellent manner in which he performed his duties.

The President also extended his personal thanks to Attorney Levy for his "outstanding contribution to the splendid record established by the United States attorneys' offices during the past 4 years."

President Eisenhower's personal letter to Attorney Levy, dated January 24, 1957, was authorized for publication by Murray Snyder, assistant to Presidential Secretary James Hagerty who is currently away from the White House. Mr. Levy leaves office February 1.

The letter bearing the President's signature follows:

JANUARY 24, 1957.

DEAR MR. LEVY: Your recent letter, tendering your resignation as United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania, effective February 1, 1957, has just come to me.

I am familiar with the excellent manner in which you have performed the duties of this office, and in accepting your resignation I want to thank you personally for your outstanding contribution to the splendid record established by the United States attorneys' offices during the past 4 years. I also want

to express my very best wishes for success and happiness in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Traffic Safety State Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety.

The consideration of an interstate compact resulted from the hearings and studies made by a Traffic Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which I am a member.

Statistics show that there are 76 million licensed automobile drivers at the present time. The average number of deaths resulting from automobile accidents is 115 per day. At the present rate of population increase and of automobile output, it will be only a comparatively short time until 100 million licensed drivers will be operating high-powered cars on our Nation's highways. If accidents continue to increase at the present rate, it can be estimated that in the near future there will be 150 fatal automobile accidents per day.

Our Traffic Safety Subcommittee has started the study of various phases of this problem—automotive engineering, highway construction, law enforcement, education, and uniform highway markings and traffic signals.

Numerous governmental agencies at various levels as well as many private organizations have been working valiantly to reduce the frightful loss of life and property. It is evident that many of these efforts, worthy as they are, do not always work in the same direction.

Furthermore, by the United States Constitution, the Federal Government dare not overstep the authority of the several States. In fact, the States have established their own traffic laws and regulations. Thus, there is no uniform legal code for enforcement, no uniform highway marking system, and no uniform educational program. Certain private organizations have attempted to urge a coordination of these efforts, but no specific authority or program exists to permit the several States to join in a mutual effort.

For this reason, this House joint resolution would grant the consent of the Congress to the several States to join in the formation of a body that would have authority to legally prepare and promulgate regulations and legislation, if needed, to attempt to meet this serious problem.

This idea is not new. It is being used successfully in the interstate oil compact

and the interstate compact for crime prevention.

I hope that the Congress will study this proposal carefully and that it can be brought to the attention of all of the States in this manner. It further is hoped that the Traffic Safety Subcommittee will be both continued and encouraged in pursuing the work that it has started so ably under the chairmanship of the Honorable KENNETH ROBERTS, of Alabama.

I feel confident that the States will welcome such authority to coordinate their efforts. My own State of Indiana is keenly interested in this work. It has accomplished much in this field and will be happy to pass on to others the results of its experience. At the same time, our State realizes that there is much to do and more to learn. This mutual exchange of ideas and cooperation in this never-ending battle will be a worthy program for all of the States.

Analysis of the Anderson-Jensen Bill Introduced January 30, 1957 (H. R. 4108) Amending the Soil Bank Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4108 provides the following five important features:

FIFTY-ONE MILLION ACRES MINIMUM CORN ALLOTMENT

First, it meets the problem of an unrealistic acreage allotment for corn. Unless we take immediate action, I am told that only a small percentage of farmers in the commercial corn area are expected to comply with the present allotment of 37 million acres. The result will be wide open production of corn, the glutting of the market if we have reasonably good crops, and a possibly disastrous effect on the feed and livestock economy.

By providing a minimum acreage allotment for corn of 51 million acres we can hope to accomplish many things. Foremost among these, of course, will be widespread compliance with the allotment program and a material reduction in corn production. Additionally, we will be giving to corn a fair minimum acreage allotment as we have done for certain other basic commodities.

CORN ALLOTMENT APPORTIONED ON BASIS OF TILLABLE ACREAGE

Under the present program basing corn acreage allotments on previous planting histories, inequities are perpetuated and many good farmers are penalized. Corn production in the commercial area is unique in this regard. I am convinced and I believe the vast majority of farmers agree with me that tillable acreage is the only fair, equitable, and sensible basis for apportioning

corn acreage allotments. Since this is a detail of administration and has no material bearing on any other aspect of the legislation, there should certainly be no objection to the provision directing that corn acreage allotments be apportioned solely on the basis of tillable acreage. This change is in the best interests of the program, the farmers involved, and the land itself.

NINETY PERCENT OF PARITY SUPPORTS FOR FAMILY-SIZE FARMS

Critics of the price support program almost invariably point to the very large operators as the beneficiaries of such programs. They cite the extremely large CCC loans as horrible examples. Then they claim that price supports actually are not for the benefit of the small farmers anyway so we might as well do away with them. While this provision of our bill will benefit the small farmer first and most, it will in a very short time also benefit the larger farmer by increasing the price of corn and in turn other feed grains will rise in price comparable to the feed value of corn; and generally speaking the price of feed determines the price of livestock over any 12-month period.

This third, and very important, provision is to the effect that 90 percent of parity price supports shall be made available on the first 4,000 bushels of corn produced on each farm eligible for such supports. That will take care of most of the family-size operations. At the same time, the big operators will also have the protective benefits of this umbrella over the smaller operations. First, they will have the 90 percent of parity protection on their first 4,000 bushels of production; second, they will have the general protection of the market-strengthening effects of this price level plus the stabilizing effects of the surplus-reducing results of this and other sections of the bill.

Take Iowa for instance, and say the average corn allotment is 50 acres per farm. With an average yield of 60 bushels to the acre, a total of 3,000 bushels, the average farmer in Iowa would have his corn protected at a minimum of 90 percent of parity or at a price between \$1.50 and \$1.55.

CROPLAND EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF ALLOTMENT MUST GO INTO SOIL BANK PROGRAM

The fourth provision is to the effect that a farmer must cut cropland equal to 20 percent of his corn acreage allotment into the soil bank or conservation reserve in order to be eligible for the price supports provided in the previous section. Farmers recognize that they must make a major contribution to the solution of their own problems and the best way they can do that is to help reduce the surplus. They will do that by putting land into the soil bank or conservation reserve as a condition of eligibility for the price support. They are asking for something, and they are willing to give something in return. Farmers throughout America are willing to make justified sacrifices providing equivalent protection is given their economy. This is a most equitable provision of the bill and it is deserving of unanimous approval along with the other provisions.

ALL FARMERS MADE ELIGIBLE FOR CONSERVATION RESERVE

The cross-compliance section of the Soil Bank Act provides that any farmer in the commercial area who was not in compliance with the corn base or allotment could not participate in either section of the soil bank program. Now to me that simply does not make sense, as it tends to defeat the fundamental objectives of the program, namely, to get surplus-producing land out of production. Corn is not our only surplus commodity. We have a similar and companion problem in all of the other feed grains.

There is no justifiable reason for keeping this provision in the present law. Experience has shown that it is no inducement whatsoever to farmers to obtain their compliance with corn acreage allotments. At the same time, it has kept untold acres out of the low-cost conservation reserve and in the production of surplus feed grains like barley and oats. By eliminating this restriction, we will open up the conservation reserve to thousands of farmers who may then put surplus-producing lands into the soil bank program. For example, a farmer who has a 50-acre corn allotment now could put 10 acres of his other than corn allotted acres in conservation reserve, and be in full compliance.

In order to make the soil-bank program effective we must do two things. First, we must make it possible for more farmers to participate. H. R. 4108 does just that. Second, we must set the payment rates high enough to attract participation. Last year some of the payment rates were too low. They must be adjusted in this year's program.

The gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, a farm owner and operator, who has rendered outstanding service to the farm people and American agriculture in the Congress for many years, has joined me in the introduction of this bill.

Farm legislation is, of course, intended to have its primary impact upon agriculture and farm people. However, I again urge my colleagues and others from non-farm districts to keep in mind the effect of slumps in purchasing power of rural areas on their business and industry. The businessmen in my district know that their economic status is tied directly to the level of the farm economy in their trade areas. It is well to occasionally remind businessmen in other areas that they, too, have a real stake in the farm economy. The annual Federal spending of \$35 billion for national defense has created the artificial prosperity now enjoyed by nonfarmers with its huge payrolls and profits. But after that, then what?

It is noteworthy that when the farmer's dollar buys 100 cents worth of goods at the counter, records show that he buys $2\frac{1}{2}$ times more goods on an average per capita than other average Americans, because he purchases such costly goods as tractors, pickers, combines, implements of every nature, trucks, lumber, posts, wire, commercial feeds, seeds, and so forth, that other Americans do not require; hence, with reduced farmer pur-

chasing, it is immediately felt by many, and in time by all.

In conclusion let us not forget that all new wealth springs from mother earth and that every American is employed in producing, transporting, processing, and marketing the raw products which spring from mother earth, is pumped or mined out of the earth, or is fished out of the waters; and that the quantity of these raw products, coupled with the price paid per unit, determines our national income in normal times. Also, history records that when a farmer's cash crop, such as corn, for example, is too low in price, the corn farmer must, of necessity, plant more acres of corn, in order to have sufficient income to meet the high costs of operation, machinery, and so forth, which he must have for the economical operation of his farm; hence, in order to reduce corn production the first requirement is to support corn at not less than 90 percent of parity as provided in our bill.

The duty of Congress is to pass a good farm law. The duty of the Department of Agriculture is to administer that law as Congress, in plain words, directs. We must act very soon, as seeding and planting time will soon be here.

Boy Scouts Stand for Character and Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on this 47th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America, we salute the 26 million boys—and men—who have lived up to the Scout oath and law since 1910.

The spiritual ideals and the healthy out-of-doors training of this organization have helped immeasurably to strengthen American manhood in body and mind and soul.

"Onward for God and my country."

There is no finer objective for American boys, and the results over 47 years have earned the genuine gratitude of the Nation.

At the rededication ceremonies to be held on February 8, we are sure that the impressive accomplishments of this youth movement that is always first to volunteer its services to community programs and to assist in time of emergency, will open the eyes of many boys to the honor and the responsibility of being a Boy Scout.

A good Scout learns the joy that comes from helping other people.

He builds radiant health through his participation in planned outdoor activities.

He gains knowledge about the natural wonders of field and stream and forest, and the self-reliance that comes with camping out.

He knows the pioneering meaning of freedom and the obligations that go with it.

He gains the recognition and respect of his elders, in preparation for becoming a man.

Happy birthday to the Boy Scouts of America, and our thanks to them for the training that will make them the leaders of tomorrow.

Education and the Liberal Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1957, Park College, one of the fine colleges in my district, held its annual midsemester convocation and conferred a well merited honorary doctor of laws degree upon one of Missouri's most distinguished citizens, Senator STUART SYMINGTON.

Upon that occasion, Senator SYMINGTON delivered an address which is so germane to the times that I feel it should be made available to the public.

In this timely presentation, Senator SYMINGTON points out that the increasing emphasis on physical science and vocational training programs should not be permitted to crowd out basic educational work in the liberal arts.

Because of the scientific demands of this nuclear age, we are in danger of losing our moral and cultural equilibrium, which is so necessary to the proper evaluation of human relationships. In this address, given in my district, Senator SYMINGTON clearly points out that a balance is not only possible but necessary:

EDUCATION AND THE LIBERAL ARTS

The honor you have just extended me makes this one of the most memorable days of my life. It is a great privilege to be included in your distinguished group of graduates.

For many years the people of Missouri and of America have watched with interest and admiration the educational achievements of Park College.

Your school, with its unique approach to the training and development of human personality, richly deserves its high-ranking position among our universities and colleges.

Your efforts are more vital than ever before, because the United States is in urgent need of moral leadership commensurate with its industrial, scientific, and military strength.

The mental genius of such men as the Comptons and Einstein, coupled with the practical applications of Edison and Ford, have formed our Nation into a complex network of science, technology, and industrial development.

As a result, each year our expanding economy demands more and more highly trained people.

We also need scientific personnel in order to keep America abreast of the startling technological advances made by the possible enemy.

Amidst our concern about maintaining national prosperity and relative technical competence, however, is growing awareness that something else is also required—moral and cultural development.

History shows that moral and cultural development are dependent upon man's success in his efforts to wrest a livelihood from nature. But it is also true that while such development is possible it is not inevitable, and in the past it has always been limited to a comparatively small portion of the populace.

The early Greeks achieved high standards of living and culture—but only for the few, because Grecian society of the fifth and sixth centuries B. C. was based on slavery.

Elizabethan England had a comparatively high standard of culture for the few, the ruling class. Here, too, culture was based on the conquest and exploitation of other peoples.

Now, for the first time in history, we can have high standards of morality and culture, based, not on exploitation of human beings but rather on use of machines, with the consequent elevation of human dignity.

However, in our world of jet airplanes, atomic reactors, and mechanical brains, and even after two great wars, man is still unable to find the road that leads to the ultimate goal of world peace.

It is easier to obtain money for H-bombs than for hospitals.

We build up our highways, but neglect our teachers.

We work long hours on our jobs, but take little time to develop cultural interests.

I do not wish to belittle in any way the importance of combat weapons, transportation facilities, or business activity, and the need is obvious for national security, technical skills, and specialized aptitudes.

Along with our faith in the importance of our new inventions, however, lies the hidden danger that by constantly giving priority to the know-how we may obscure the know-why. If that happens, like Alice in Wonderland, we will be rushing ahead without knowing where we are going.

Dr. Peter Viereck, professor of history and Pulitzer prize winner described this possibility when he said:

"The Atomic Age puts a new premium on the technician and on practical applications of inner theory.

"Yet, without the understanding of man's inner nature which art and literature give us, and without the inner ethical restraint which religion gives us, our outer mechanical progress is paving our road to hell with good inventions."

A wise statement, justifying the belief of many of us that we must maintain our moral and cultural equilibrium.

But the record shows we are losing that equilibrium.

A recent survey states that of all the discharges from some 76 American corporations, 10 percent were for lack of know-how, 90 percent because of character defects.

According to a leading industrialist, an inventory of 100 members of his management personnel showed that only 4 lacked job know-how, and only 8 did poor quality work. On the other side of the scale, 21 percent failed in initiative, 20 percent in leadership, and 19 percent failed in management ability.

As a result of such surveys as these, in an effort to teach them the broader phases of business responsibility, more and more industries are sending their junior executives to colleges and universities.

The basic reason for the need to reeducate these men may well be that they were the product of a shift in American educational values.

From the time of the Declaration of Independence until about the beginning of the 20th century, college students almost universally exposed to such subjects as history, literature, metaphysics, logic, and ethics.

As noted by Dr. H. W. Stoke, dean of the University of Washington Graduate School:

"Yesterday the educated man knew much of history—ancient, medieval and modern; he knew something of the lives of great men;

he could identify the 13 decisive battles of the world; he studied foreign languages, and moral philosophy. He studied his conversation with literary allusions."

While such knowledge may still be admired, it is now relegated to second place, because it is no longer considered practical.

Today, it takes considerable time and effort to become proficient in any field. Therefore, our college students have tended more and more to specialize. Their former goal of a broad liberal arts education has been replaced by the goal of becoming competent, because for many years the most sought after man has been the competent man.

Under strong economic pressures, it is not surprising that many of our educational institutions revamped their curriculum, substituting physics for art, electronics for literature, and engineering for philosophy.

As stated in a recent Saturday Evening Post article:

"For many years the technical schools—particularly the engineering schools—prided themselves on the practicality of their curriculums. There was no time for cultural fardelard and classical nonsense. Faculty and students alike took grim satisfaction in a policy of all work and no play."

Thus, the scientific revolution touched off a chain reaction. It created economic pressures which in turn influenced our educational institutions.

The tragic results of this latter change are now becoming apparent.

A generation of competent specialists has graduated; and with their entrance into the stream of human activity the previously mentioned chain reaction has spread into the social and political spheres.

In these areas the effects are most disturbing.

The Ben Franklins and Thomas Jeffersons have been replaced by men in gray flannel suits, most of whom prefer Univac to Plato.

As pointed out by Dr. Ernest O. Melby, dean of the School of Education of New York University, in many cases:

"Our education has failed to equip men to think and to discriminate between that which builds our freedom and that which destroys it."

A tragic recent example of this statement might be the famous physicist, J. Robert Oppenheimer, one of the world's most brilliant living scientists.

In an eloquent and moving public statement, Dr. Oppenheimer told the Atomic Energy Commission that he knew nothing of history, economics, or political science until approaching middle age.

This case is significant. Perhaps it brings into sharp focus the meaning of the poet who said, "No man is an island entire of itself."

Because of our fascination with the miraculous achievements of science perhaps we are creating a generation of technically competent human islands.

And they are important, not only to further our prosperity, but also to aid in the preservation of our freedom against the growing Communist aggression.

But no company or country can survive on competence alone. Human beings cannot be measured with a slide rule. Human problems cannot be solved with the charts and graphs and equipment of a laboratory.

President Ellis of the University of Missouri recently pointed out to me the following able quotation from the president of the Carnegie Corp.:

"We are beginning to understand that one of the marks of a modern complex society is an insatiable appetite for educated talent. It is not just technologists and scientists that we need. We desperately need gifted teachers, professional men, scholars, critics, and seers."

"The tremendous rewards for specialization encourage narrow training; and for certain purposes of science, business, and gov-

ernment this is useful. But a world of ever-ramifying specialties soon cries out for generalists."

"The most forward-looking of our colleges and universities are making active efforts to insure that every specialist will build his specialty on a base of general education."

In short, says this authority, we must have more thinking men; men who can judge values, because we have now become so efficient in the means of mass destruction that one wrong decision might result in oblivion.

It was H. G. Wells who wrote, "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

To be sure of winning that race we must reexamine our educational ideals and adopt standards to insure the development of well-rounded individuals—men and women as capable of coming to grips with moral and spiritual problems as with those of the atom.

The hard-working, rough-talking, highly competent engineering and business ramrods of 20 or 30 years ago are now outmoded.

Some of our more forward-looking technical schools have become aware of this fact and are revising their curriculum accordingly.

As Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., president of MIT, puts it:

"The specialist must shun the view that lopsidedness is laudable; he must be politically and morally responsible; he must test his actions by their human impact."

It is not only our technical schools, however, who need to take a long look at their present educational programs.

While it is true that the liberal arts have been relegated to a position of secondary importance at some of our universities and colleges, perhaps part of the reason was the unwillingness of liberal arts exponents to adapt themselves to the changing needs of their students.

As noted by one liberal arts advocate:

"The scientist has come to be the poet of modernity and we students of the ages—especially of the Middle Ages—had better realize it."

My point here is that liberal arts studies can and should be adapted to the special needs of students majoring in other fields. I feel sure this can be accomplished without compromising any of the basic values of the arts.

After all, should we not keep in mind that if Shakespeare were alive today, he would probably be the world's greatest television and moving picture playwright.

We must also strengthen and improve the liberal arts curriculum in our high schools.

During this period of their education, the minds of our youth are eager for general knowledge—often they are still seeking a field for later concentration.

By instructing them in the liberal arts, we will not only help them make that choice but also plant in their minds an inquisitive spirit, which we hope would continue to grow in later years.

As pointed out recently by one of our leading industrialists:

"The role of leadership in tomorrow's world will be assumed neither by those who know a great deal about a very little or a very little about a great deal. It will be discharged only by those whose thinking is broad and uninhibited, those with grasp and understanding—leaders, in short, whose horizons are wide enough to comprehend the world in which we live."

In summary, the goal we seek for all students, regardless of field or educational level, is the development of individual perspective—the ability to see things in proper relationship, so they can do their part in moving the world onward and upward.

Achievement of this goal will mean more than a better life. It will mean our continued progress as a free people.

Leadership of the free world in this nuclear age is a challenge which we must now

face, with care and courage, if some day we are to attain the glory of that ultimate world described many years ago by Rabin-dranath Tagore.

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
Where words come out from the depth of truth;
Where tireless striving stretches its arms towards perfection;
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habit;
Where the mind is led forward by thee into ever-widening thought and action—
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake."

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to register two protests against recent rulings and statements coming out of the Defense Department, which I feel deserve special consideration by the Congress.

SIX MONTHS' TRAINING

My first protest is to the recent order of the Department of Defense requiring 6 months of active duty in the United States Army for enlistees of the National Guard.

This is entirely unrealistic and arbitrary, and I feel the order was made with a view of weakening the National Guard organization. The Department of Defense has arbitrarily established the 6 months' training period only because it is the maximum period authorized by Congress.

The Army's basic individual training consists of a period of 8 weeks. This is followed by another 8 weeks of advanced individual training. There is no established training program for the remaining part of the 6 months' program of the Defense Department. According to the Department's regulation, the remaining 8 weeks are to be spent in unit training.

I feel that the 8-week individual basic training could probably be accomplished to the best advantage in the Army; however, I definitely feel that it would be more advantageous to the entire program if the individual were then returned to the unit in the National Guard to which he was originally assigned where he will continue to serve for the remainder of his enlistment period.

In the Middle Western States, and this is especially true in my State of South Dakota, a large percentage of the youth live on farms and are either engaged in farming individually or possibly with their parents. These young men are the foundation upon which the defense of America rests. They comprise a large percentage of the South Dakota National Guard personnel, and to require

them to take more than the regular 8 weeks of basic training is purely a waste of agricultural manpower.

During the war, when basic training was of utmost importance, the American youth were given 8 weeks basic and then a large percentage of them were sent directly into combat. If 8 weeks of basic training were sufficient for these young men during times of war, certainly 8 weeks of basic training, coupled with the regular and intensive training as a part of the National Guard units, is sufficient for the defense of this country. The longer we keep them on active duty in the Army after the 8 weeks of basic training, the greater is the cost of the training, both to the individual, his profession, and the Government, without adequate return.

South Dakota has one of the outstanding National Guard units in the country. It has always been among the first to be called in every conflict, and it has always served with distinction. Early mobilization of the South Dakota National Guard in times of need has been motivated because of the advanced trained readiness of these units.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY WILSON

The second great injustice is the unfortunate and uninformed statement of the very capable but unpredictable Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, when he said the National Guard was sort of a scandal during the Korean war, which he said was used as a draft-dodging business to escape fighting in Korea.

Mr. Wilson apparently had failed to inform himself that South Dakota had approximately 4,000 National Guard men and that approximately 1,900 of these men and officers were ordered to active duty shortly after Korea started, and that the remainder of the trained volunteers were prepared to leave at a moment's notice.

There may be some State guard units that are not up to military standards, but this does not include the South Dakota National Guard, and I feel that those State guards, such as South Dakota's, that are up to standard, are entitled to an apology.

SOUTH DAKOTA GUARD

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Secretary of Defense Wilson would do well to check the history and record of the South Dakota National Guard. It inherits from an illustrious past the continuous record of patriotic volunteer service of many of its pioneer sons—those who grouped together to meet the hostile Indians—those who followed General Custer in his last stand at the fatal Little Big Horn in 1876—all of them heroes who deserve mention with the valiant forerunners who helped to subjugate and civilize the vast western plains and mountains now comprising the State of South Dakota.

Under the stress of the Indian outbreak of 1862, the first territorial governor organized a territorial militia. Practically every able-bodied man who was not already in the United States volunteer service became a member of it. Six companies organized during the Indian troubles were the first to serve in the organized militia of Dakota. Historical accounts of the service and secu-

rity given by these early fighters have found deserving places in many libraries. A reorganization of the territorial militia was ordered by the Governor in August 1864. In his biennial report dated September 30, 1888, the adjutant general of the Territory reported with pardonable pride that "Dakota alone of all the Territories maintains a military force that in numbers and efficiency outranks that of many of the Commonwealths of the Nation."

Following the admission of South Dakota to the Union as a State in 1889, the organized militia maintained its organization and standards of efficiency until the Spanish-American War, when components of the first regiment, South Dakota National Guard, were mustered into Federal service and participated in a number of battles and engagements in the Philippine Islands.

The regiment was mustered out in 1899 and President McKinley was present at Aberdeen, S. Dak., to welcome the returning regiment and convey the appreciation of the Nation to the South Dakota soldiers for their gallant service.

Units of the South Dakota National Guard fought with distinction as front-line combat units during World War II in both the Pacific and European theaters. During the Korean war the South Dakota National Guard was also activated for 2 years and units served in Alaska and Europe.

HISTORY OF SERVICE

The 109th Engineers has a history going back to the 1800's as the unit served valiantly at the Battle of Manila in the Philippines during the Spanish-American War as the 1st Regiment, South Dakota National Guard. It was reorganized into the 4th Infantry and served under "Black Jack" Pershing in the Pancho Villa campaign during the Mexican Border incident in 1916. Mustered out of Federal service at Fort Crook, Nebr., on March 3, 1917, it was drafted back into Federal service on August 5, 1917, for duty during World War I. The unit participated in 6 campaigns in France and was commended by the Allied commander in chief. On February 10, 1941, the 109th Engineers were inducted into Federal service as part of the 34th Division. On June 14, 1942, the 109th Engineers were among the first American troop units to land in the European Theater of Operations. In 1942 the unit participated in the assault landing in Algeria.

As a combat battalion, the South Dakota guardsmen distinguished themselves in many ways during the remainder of World War II. They served over 500 days of actual combat, one of the longest of any American unit in the ETO. They served in 7 campaigns, winning the French Croix-de-Guerre. During the Korean war the unit was recalled to Federal service and was stationed overseas in Europe most of their 2 years of active duty.

THE 196TH RCT

The 196th Regimental Combat Team of South Dakota is descendant from the 6 companies of Territorial militia. The 1st South Dakota Infantry, which is the parent organization of both the 109th

Engineers and the 196th RCT, served actively in the Philippine Insurrection. South Dakota guardsmen served on the Mexican border in 1916 and worked hard for maintenance and expansion of the 196th RCT in future years. Units of the 196th served with the 41st Division in World War I. In World War II South Dakota guardsmen served with the 34th Division from north Africa through Italy. During the Korean war the 196th Regimental Combat Team was called to active duty for 2 years, taking extensive winter combat training in Colorado and then were stationed in Alaska for the remainder of their active-duty tour.

THE 147TH FIELD ARTILLERY

The 147th Field Artillery Battalion also has a history tracing back to the First South Dakota Infantry Regiment that later served in the Philippines and on the Mexican border. During World War I units of the 196th and the 147th Field Artillery had battle honors for campaigns at Lorraine, Alsace, Aisne-Marne, Champagne, Oise-Aisne, and Meuse-Argonne. On November 25, 1940, the 147th was again activated for Federal service in World War II, and they have battle honors for the East Indies, New Guinea, Bismarck Archipelago, and Luzon in the Philippines.

OTHER UNITS

The 179th Field Artillery Battalion served in World War I beginning July 1917 and has the same campaign streamers as the 147th Field Artillery. In World War II they were activated in January 1941 and fought with distinction through north Africa and Italy with campaign streamers for Tunisia, Sicily, Naples-Foggia, Rome-Arno, North Apennines, and Po Valley.

THE GUARD NATIONALLY

Older than the Nation it serves, the National Guard has the longest continuous history of any military organization in the United States. As the outgrowth of the early militia concept which provided for the common defense, its origin can be traced back to the first years of the 17th century when the early settlers, in order to protect their lives and property, banded together to form militia companies. These companies were equipped and trained according to the needs of the times. As the Nation grew, the militia grew, and as towns sprang up and States were admitted into the Union, additional units were formed for local and national protection. The distinction of being the oldest National Guard unit in the United States is shared by the 101st Engineer Battalion and the 182d Infantry Regiment, Massachusetts, which trace their history back to October 1636 when the General Court at Boston ordered that all military men in the area were to be formed into militia regiments. Two of those regiments, the North and East, later became the 182d Infantry and the 101st Engineer Regiment.

In 1775 the Committee of Safety of the Second Continental Congress organized the militia units throughout the Colonies into an overall defense force, from which came approximately 165,000 of the 396,000 troops raised for Gen. George Washington's Continental Army.

During the period 1776-90, specific military laws were passed by the States, generally causing the enrollment of all free males between certain ages as a proper, natural, and safe defense of a free State. The substance of these laws was based upon the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation to the extent that it was realized a well-regulated militia was necessary which should not be superior to civil power or assume the role of a standing army in time of peace—the concept of the National Guard as a State-supported organization of local volunteers.

The principles of the citizen-soldier were written into the Constitution of the United States. Section 8, article I, of the Constitution empowered the Congress to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection and repel invasion, and for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, reserving to the States the appointment of officers and the training of the militia according to discipline prescribed by the Congress. The second amendment to the Constitution—article II of the Bill of Rights—recognized the right of the citizen-soldier, in the interests of "a well-regulated militia" to keep and bear arms. Ultimately, this basic authority was to result in the establishment of the National Guard in its present form.

The National Guard has played an important part in providing well-trained troops and units for the several wars in which the United States has engaged during its history, including wars with the Indians; the War of 1812; Mexican War; Civil War; Spanish-American War; Mexican border incident, 151,000 men; World War I, 382,000 men; World War II, 300,000 men; and the Korean conflict, 183,000 men.

SUMMARY

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is a poor time to cut the spirit out of the National Guard by referring to them as a draft-dodging unit, and likewise a poor time to cut the heart out of the National Guard by summarily ordering a 6 months' training period. I hope that if the Defense Department does not take action to correct this injustice, the Congress will.

Anniversary of Birth of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that February 12 is the birthday of Abraham Lincoln and Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko. Separated though they were by time and space, they were kindred souls, dedicated to the cause of human freedom.

We are all familiar with the part played by General Kosciuszko in our own

fight for freedom. To reiterate would be repetitious.

Today it is ironical that a country whose sons fought for American independence, a country whose roots strike deep in American soil going back to colonial Virginia and the stirring story of the pioneers in the Ohio and Mississippi Valley, that a country from which has come the spirit as well as the blood, bone, and sinew of our independence and industrial strength, that that country is still a captive suffering Communist oppression.

Like Lincoln, General Kosciuszko wrote his devotion to the cause of human freedom in deeds. Today the Polish people behind the Iron Curtain are struggling for the freedom, political and economic, which is their birthright. Our tribute to General Kosciuszko, the engineer of our fortifications at West Point, should be in deeds.

Poland needs economic assistance to gain economic independence from the Soviet. Polish displaced persons need liberation of our immigration laws so that they may find a haven here. Poland and the other captive nations are waiting to hear the Voice of America raised in the United Nations in protest against Soviet aggression and crimes against these captives. That voice, like the voice of Lincoln, must be raised in the United Nations so that "government of, by, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

A Constitutional Vacuum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1957

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert a speech entitled "A Constitutional Vacuum" which was given by Congressman FRANK T. Bow before the Women's Patriotic Conference, and I also include resolution No. 8 which was adopted by the conference in regard to the NATO Status of Forces Treaty.

A CONSTITUTIONAL VACUUM

(By FRANK T. BOW)

Madam Chairman, delegates, and patriots all, it is a comfort and inspiration to me to see this evidence of the interest which the women of our country, particularly the members of the organizations represented here, have in the welfare of our country. The best patriots we have are the women who are alert to the dangers confronting us, the threats to our Constitution, and the enemies both without and within our country. I am sure this conference will give new vitality to your efforts.

I have been asked to tell you this morning what happens when our servicemen are surrendered to foreign courts. Two words will describe their status. They are thrown into a constitutional vacuum. The net effect is to deprive them of United States citizenship, at least during their trial, and after conviction, as long as it may take to comply with the sentence of the foreign court. This is the result of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, which is a treaty, or the Administration Agreement with Japan, which is not

a treaty, or the 50-odd agreements with other nations of the world, which are so-called executive agreements, all of which concern the status of our troops serving in such foreign countries.

Most of these agreements give to the foreign nations concerned the right to exercise criminal jurisdiction over the members of our Armed Forces for offenses committed when off duty.

This right can be waived by the foreign authority and there are many trivial charges made in which this jurisdiction is waived. But if the foreign authority insists on prosecution, the unfortunate serviceman is turned over to the foreign court for trial. He may be left in the custody of American forces until called up for trial, but, if so, foreign authorities can demand his appearance at any time. From then on he has lost any and all guaranties or rights given to every citizen of the United States by our Constitution. That is our constitutional vacuum. It is the creation of those in the executive department who negotiated these agreements with foreign powers. They were individuals who enjoyed immunity from foreign laws.

Now remember that most of our servicemen who have been accused of some offense when off duty are stationed in countries where the language, customs, and laws are strange to them. The atmosphere is frightening, if not hostile. An accused serviceman can only guess what is going on for interpreters are lacking or inexperienced. This unfortunately has been true of the interpreting done in many trials as well as in the preliminary proceedings.

RIGHTS ARE LOST

There is no grand jury as we know it in most foreign countries. The preliminary investigation is by an officer or magistrate who has considerable power with respect to accumulating evidence and preparing charges. The written statements secured by him from complainants and other witnesses play an important part in the trial. Furnished to the judge before trial he has an opportunity to reach a verdict of guilt before the trial starts. In fact, the written statements are frequently accepted as evidence without calling the witnesses in person. Obviously then the accused is not confronted by the witnesses against him. Even when a witness is called, the right of cross-examination, which is the principal value of confrontation, is lost through procedure. All questions must be funneled through the chief judge, who may decide whether or not to ask them, and he may rephrase to suit himself.

The accused is presumed to be guilty from the start. The presumption of innocence is practically unknown in foreign courts. There is no burden of proof on the prosecution to prove the accused guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. He does not have the privilege of remaining silent. Confessions secured by threats or force or other involuntary means can be used against him.

There are other rights he would have under our Constitution which he may lose but the ones I have mentioned are certain to be lost. This has been confirmed by a study of laws of foreign countries made by the Judge Advocate General of the Army, on orders of the Senate. Defenders of the status agreements are prone to deny that constitutional rights are lost, but the conclusion of the Judge Advocate General in this instance brooks no denial.

DISGRACEFUL COMPROMISE

The NATO Status of Forces Agreement and similar agreements are deceptive in that they provide certain so-called safeguards for the accused. Our Attorney General has called these "civilized standards of justice." That is a disgraceful compromise with principle. The provisions bear no resemblance to the rights granted by our Constitution.

And foreign courts sometimes ignore these safeguards.

The right of appeal in foreign courts amounts to double jeopardy. The reviewing court has the right to receive additional evidence and to impose a different sentence. The fact that a sentence may be increased by appeal frequently discourages this step. Records of appeals show that frequently the prosecutor has perfected an appeal after a conviction solely for the purpose of securing a greater sentence.

One of the safeguards in the agreements usually is that the accused may communicate with a representative of his government and have such representative present at the trial, if the rules of court permit. This representative is the only link the accused has with his government, and the function of this representative is merely to observe and report to the commander in the area. He cannot take part in the trial.

During the last session of Congress the Secretary of Defense was authorized to employ counsel for accused servicemen when he deemed necessary. It was hoped this would remedy the indifference of counsel appointed by the courts. It has probably been of some benefit to various accused. It seems, however, that even such counsel feel more of an obligation to the court, and their colleague who may be prosecuting, than to the accused.

COURT-MARTIAL SYSTEM

Some supporters of the status agreements have claimed that anyone joining the Armed Forces automatically loses his constitutional rights. This is not true. His rights are still set forth in the Constitution and insured by law. Congress under its power to make laws for the Government of the land and naval forces has enacted the Uniform Code of Military Justice which was intended to govern our forces at home and abroad. This code specifically gives to the accused serviceman all those rights under our Constitution which the Judge Advocate General has said he would lose in a foreign court.

These defenders of the agreements make a point of saying there is no trial by jury in a court-martial, this supposedly excusing the lack of a jury in foreign trials. Actually the court-martial procedure amounts to a jury trial. There is a trial board consisting of both officers and enlisted men, if the accused desires, and he enjoys the right to challenge for cause and a peremptory challenge, just as in a civil court. Then there is an elaborate system of review and appeal provided for servicemen, ending with the Court of Military Appeals, composed of three civilians. Finally, there is an appeal to the President. No American intervention, not even the President, can stop the processes of foreign justice, once started.

Our serviceman on trial in a foreign court remains in a vacuum of expatriation until he has been convicted and has paid the penalty imposed. When the wife of Private Keefe sought to secure his release by habeas corpus proceeding, the court said Keefe was beyond the jurisdiction of the United States.

After a convicted serviceman has paid his fine or served his sentence he is returned by the foreign authorities to the jurisdiction of the United States commander in the area. Perhaps he did not have a fair trial. Reports of observers have shown some failures of justice. Perhaps he would not have been convicted under our system of jurisprudence. Yet his conviction by a foreign court is the measure of his discharge. He will be classed as undesirable, his discharge only a degree above dishonorable.

I consider it an outrage that we enlist or induct men into the service of our country, or assign reservists to active duty, to protect and defend our country and its institutions, and then deprive them of the guaranties of

our Constitution when they are sent abroad on duty which is not of their choosing.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

Every enlisted man takes an oath that he will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over him according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The United States Manual for Courts-Martial provided by Executive Order in 1951, by authority of the Uniform Code, contains this paragraph:

"Under international law, jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces of the United States or other sovereign who commit offenses in the territory of a friendly foreign state in which the visiting armed force is by consent quartered or in passage remains in the visiting sovereign."

Now this rule of international law has been flouted and superseded by the Status of Forces Treaty and similar agreements.

Those who negotiated the agreements would have us believe there never was such a rule. This in spite of the fact that it was stated clearly by Chief Justice Marshall in 1811, followed several times since by our Supreme Court, and asserted by the United States in the Supreme Court of Canada in 1943.

As recently as last May, a court in Japan recognized this rule of international law, but claimed that we had waived our rights through administrative agreement with Japan. He also mentioned we had lost face as well. The Japanese court said:

"An armed force constitutes the fighting power of a country and is a symbol of its dignity. Consequently, it is a well-established rule of international law that an armed force stationed in a foreign country in accordance with a treaty, is not subject to civil or criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state."

It is obvious that our forces are no longer a symbol of dignity in Japan. We have lost face there by the surrender of our rights through the administrative agreement. The same Japanese court made this plain by the orders which it tried to enforce in the case where it made its pronouncement. It is also evident from the fact that two-thirds of our servicemen imprisoned in foreign countries are in Japan.

CANADA PROTECTS ITS MEN

The Canadian Government is also very conscious of this rule of international law. Canadian troops are now a part of the international police force now on duty in Egypt. The Minister of Defense was asked in the House of Commons if the Canadians would be governed by the Canadian Code of Military Discipline or when punishment had to be dealt out would they be tried by an Egyptian court or by some international court-martial. The Minister of Defense was emphatic in his answer. I quote this colloquy from House of Commons debates of November 29, 1956, page 171:

"Mr. PEARKES. Would the Minister of National Defense advise us concerning the code of discipline under which these troops will be serving? Will the Canadians be governed by the Canadian Code of Military Discipline? When punishment has to be dealt out, will the men involved be tried by their own commanding officers or a Canadian court, or will they have to be tried by an Egyptian court or by some international court-martial? We would like to have some information as to the exercise of discipline and the protection of any of our men who may through some misfortune fall afoul of some commander from some other unit, or the laws of Egypt or elsewhere."

"Mr. CAMPNEY. This matter is now under discussion in the United Nations. But it is our contention and we are acting on this contention for the present and will continue to do so until there is any change, that our

forces will be governed by Canadian law and discipline will be administered under our own Canadian system. As I say, the question is being reviewed now in the United Nations.

"Mr. PEARKES. Would that apply to any civil offense which might be alleged against a Canadian soldier?"

"Mr. CAMPNEY. Yes. We have taken the view that that should obtain. Whether or not we will maintain that, whether other courts of an international nature will be set up or what the final disposition will be I do not know, but as for now that is our contention."

"Mr. PEARKES. I should like to express the opinion that it is very desirable that we remain firm in that stand."

"Mr. CAMPNEY. We feel quite strongly about it."

There is not sufficient time this morning to go into the circumstances surrounding the making of these agreements, the motives of the negotiators, the pressure put upon the Senate to consent to the only treaty presented to it, and what now appears downright misrepresentation of facts and law to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We have had almost 4 years of experience with the agreements and need not theorize. We should face the facts.

ACTION NEEDED

In May 1955, I presented to the House of Representatives a resolution which would have directed the President to seek a modification of all such agreements so that the right to exercise criminal jurisdiction over

our servicemen abroad for off-duty offenses would be restored to the United States. Failing such modification being secured, the President would have been directed to terminate such agreements in accordance with the terms of each. Although extensive hearings were held by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the committee voted 19 to 10 not to report the resolution to the House. I think the testimony and evidence offered in the hearings clearly showed the necessity for its adoption. Accordingly, I have again offered an identical resolution to the House which is designated House Joint Resolution 16. I might add that some of my colleagues have joined with me in offering identical resolutions, just as they did in the previous session.

I have found that there is another vacuum of information or knowledge about this matter among the American people. This is not surprising, when I know that we have had inquiries from other congressional offices as to what the Status of Forces Agreement is, or what my resolution is about. So there is much work to be done to inform our citizens of the dangers inherent in foreign service in our Armed Forces.

That is where you patriotic women can be of great help.

Inform your friends, particularly any who may have sons, husbands, or other relatives now in service or about to enter service. Generate a demand on the Congress for action. Find out where your Representative stands on this subject. Tell him your views, particularly if he is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I feel confident that

if my resolution is presented to the full body for action that it will be adopted. It is necessary that we have such an expression of the will of the people in order to recover the rights of our servicemen on duty abroad.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE 31ST WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE, INC.

RESOLUTION NO. 8—NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Whereas until July 15, 1953, American service personnel on duty in foreign countries were under United States military courts, thus retaining their rights as United States citizens while serving our country abroad; and

Whereas the ratification on July 15, 1953, of the Status of Forces Treaty of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has deprived our servicemen of the traditional protection extended by our Constitution and enjoyed by United States servicemen on foreign soil, and now subjects our men to trial, imprisonment, and even the death penalty under foreign laws in foreign civil courts and prisons: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 31st Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., petitions the Congress of the United States to support legislation which would nullify that part of the NATO treaty referring to the status of forces which deprives American servicemen of the protection of the United States Constitution when serving in more than 50 countries of the world.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, who art here and everywhere, we thank Thee for the wise and bountiful provision which Thou art daily making for our spiritual and material welfare.

We penitently confess that we frequently demand and try to gain so much from life for ourselves and are little concerned about giving help and happiness and hope unto others.

Grant that each to the extent of his ability and all with equal fidelity may be coworkers with Thee in the glorious adventure of supplying every human need and of establishing on earth the kingdom of brotherhood.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who was the world's greatest servant and its only savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the

50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

FEBRUARY 5, 1957.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 712 (a) (2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I have appointed the following members of the Banking and Currency Committee as members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: Hon. PAUL BROWN, of Georgia; Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas; Hon. ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama; Hon. HENRY O. TALLE, of Iowa; Hon. GORDON McDONOUGH, of California.

Sincerely,

BRENT SPENCE.

DO NOT WEAKEN THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the National Guard represents the development of our citizen-soldier tradition.

One of its major functions is to meet emergencies in the several States.

It is also a first line of reserve for the regular or professional Military Establishment.

The proposal, by the Defense Department, that all enlistees in the guard shall be required to complete 6 months of active-duty training with the Army, although understandable in its attempt to create a large, trained, and immediately available reserve, is not the only solution nor the desirable one.

The whole concept of National Guard training is that it will permit and attract men for military training without disrupting their jobs or homelife.

It is designed to provide "a well-regulated militia," as specified in the Constitution. It is separate and distinct from the Regular Army.

To my mind the only question is how to increase its technical proficiency, without destroying the base upon which it relies for its existence. The proposed requirement for 6 months' active duty would dry up enlistments and regulate it out of existence. This could be a thinly disguised maneuver to eliminate the National Guard and to completely federalize all military components.

Like most Americans, I have a high regard for our professional soldiers, but I have also observed how much of a trainee's time is wasted under the "hurry up and wait" programing.

Instead, I believe it is the responsibility of the regulars to streamline their training methods and provide an accelerated course.

The National Guard Association has recommended a fair compromise especially regarding men who have had no previous military experience. Otherwise active-duty training should be on a voluntary basis, consistent with the organization and the function of the National Guard.

We, in Massachusetts, are proud of the combat records of our National Guard units.